

Democratic Services

Riverside, Temple Street, Keynsham, Bristol BS31 1LA
Telephone: (01225) 477000 *main switchboard*
Direct Lines - Tel: 01225 394942 Fax: 01225 394439
Web-site - www.bathnes.gov.uk

Your ref:

Our ref: CRS

Date: 12 July 2010

E-mail: Democratic_Services@bathnes.gov.uk

To: All Members of the Cabinet

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Councillor Francine Haeberling | Leader of the Council |
| Councillor Malcolm Hanney | Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Resources |
| Councillor Terry Gazzard | Cabinet Member for Development and Major Projects |
| Councillor Charles Gerrish | Cabinet Member for Service Delivery |
| Councillor David Hawkins | Cabinet Member for The Council as Corporate Trustee |
| Councillor Vic Pritchard | Cabinet Member for Adult Social Services and Housing |
| Councillor Chris Watt | Cabinet Member for Children's Services |

Chief Executive and other appropriate officers
Press and Public

Dear Member

Cabinet: Wednesday, 21st July, 2010

You are invited to attend a meeting of the **Cabinet**, to be held on **Wednesday, 21st July, 2010** at **5.00 pm** in the **Banqueting Room - Guildhall**.

The agenda is set out overleaf.

Yours sincerely

Col Spring
for Chief Executive

The decisions taken at this meeting of the Cabinet are subject to the Council's call-in procedures. Within 5 clear working days of publication of decisions, at least 10 Councillors may signify in writing to the Chief Executive their wish for a decision to be called-in for review. If a decision is not called-in, it will be implemented after the expiry of the 5 clear working day period.

If you need to access this agenda or any of the supporting reports in an alternative accessible format please contact Democratic Services or the relevant report author whose details are listed at the end of each report.

This Agenda and all accompanying reports are printed on recycled paper

NOTES:

- 1. Inspection of Papers:** Any person wishing to inspect minutes, reports, or a list of the background papers relating to any item on this Agenda should contact Col Spring who is available by telephoning Bath 01225 394942 or by calling at the Riverside Offices Keynsham (during normal office hours).
- 2. Public Speaking at Meetings:** The Council has a scheme to encourage the public to make their views known at meetings. They may make a statement relevant to what the meeting has power to do. They may also present a petition or a deputation on behalf of a group. Advance notice is required not less than two full working days before the meeting (this means that for meetings held on Wednesdays, notice must normally be received in Democratic Services by 4.30pm the previous Friday but Bank Holidays will cause this to be brought forward).

The public may also ask a question to which a written answer will be given. Questions must be submitted in writing to Democratic Services at least two full working days in advance of the meeting (this means that for meetings held on Wednesdays, notice must normally be received in Democratic Services by 4.30pm the previous Friday but Bank Holidays will cause this to be brought forward). If an answer cannot be prepared in time for the meeting it will be sent out within five days afterwards. Further details of the scheme can be obtained by contacting Col Spring as above.

- 3. Details of Decisions taken at this meeting** can be found in the minutes which will be published as soon as possible after the meeting, and also circulated with the agenda for the next meeting. In the meantime details can be obtained by contacting Col Spring as above.

Appendices to reports are available for inspection as follows:-

Public Access points - Riverside - Keynsham, Guildhall - Bath, Hollies - Midsomer Norton, and Bath Central, Keynsham and Midsomer Norton public libraries.

For Councillors and Officers papers may be inspected via Political Group Research Assistants and Group Rooms/Members' Rooms.

- 4. Attendance Register:** Members should sign the Register which will be circulated at the meeting.
- 5. THE APPENDED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS ARE IDENTIFIED BY AGENDA ITEM NUMBER.**
- 6. Emergency Evacuation Procedure**

When the continuous alarm sounds, you must evacuate the building by one of the designated exits and proceed to the named assembly point. The designated exits are sign-posted.

Arrangements are in place for the safe evacuation of disabled people.

- 7. Officer Support to the Cabinet**
Cabinet meetings will be supported by the Director's Group.
- 8. Recorded votes**
A recorded vote will be taken on each item.

Cabinet - Wednesday, 21st July, 2010

in the Banqueting Room - Guildhall

A G E N D A

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

2. EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair will draw attention to the emergency evacuation procedure as set out under Note 6

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

To receive any declarations from Members/Officers of personal or prejudicial interests in respect of matters for consideration at this meeting. Members who have an interest to declare are asked to:

- a) State the Item Number in which they have the interest;
- b) The nature of the interest;
- c) Whether the interest is personal, or personal and prejudicial.

Any Member who is unsure about the above should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer prior to the meeting in order to expedite matters at the meeting itself.

5. TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

6. QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

At the time of publication, 2 items had been submitted

7. STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS

At the time of publication, 7 items had been submitted

8. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING WED 3RD MARCH 2010 (Pages 1 - 8)

To be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair

9. CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET

This is a standard agenda item, to cover any reports originally placed on the Weekly list for single Member decision making, which have subsequently been the subject of a Cabinet Member requisition to the full Cabinet, under the Council's procedural rules

10. CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS REFERRED BY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BODIES

This is a standing agenda item (Constitution rule 21, part 4D – Executive Procedure Rules) for matters referred by Overview and Scrutiny bodies. The Chair(person) of the relevant Overview and Scrutiny body will have the right to attend and at the discretion of the Leader to speak to the item, but not vote

11. SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING (Pages 9 - 18)

This report lists the Cabinet member decisions, sorted by Lead decision maker

12. REVIEW OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN BATH (Pages 19 - 60)

In March 2008 Council approved a strategy for the future of secondary schools in Bath & North East Somerset. In May 2008 Cabinet agreed to consult on proposed changes to some Bath schools specifically the closure of Culverhay (boys), Oldfield (girls) and St Mark's C.E. schools and a linked proposal to open one new co educational school in the north of the city and one new co-educational school in the south of the city. A public consultation exercise on this proposal was undertaken between March and May 2010 and this report sets out the results of the consultation.

13. REVIEW OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KEYNSHAM (Pages 61 - 82)

In March 2008 full Council approved a strategy for the future of secondary schools in Bath & North East Somerset. In May 2008 Cabinet agreed to consult on proposed changes to Keynsham schools, specifically the closure of Broadlands Community School and the expansion of Wellsway Community School to create a single secondary school for Keynsham. A public consultation exercise on this proposal was undertaken between March and May 2010 and this report sets out the results of the consultation.

14. TREASURY MANAGEMENT OUTTURN REPORT 2009/10 (Pages 83 - 92)

In February 2010 the Council adopted the 2009 edition of the CIPFA Treasury Management in the Public Services: Code of Practice, which requires the Council to approve a Treasury Management Strategy before the start of each financial year, a mid year report, and an annual report after the end of each financial year. This report gives details of performance against the Council's Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Plan for 2009/10.

15. REVENUE AND CAPITAL OUTTURN 2009/10 (Pages 93 - 116)

The report presents the provisional revenue and capital outturn for 2009/10. It refers to known potential revenue pressures for the current year, as a preface to a request to carry forward specific revenue budget items to 2010/11, and to write-off revenue overspends where recovery in future years, in combination with containing those pressures in the current year, would have an adverse impact on continuing service delivery. The report also refers to requests to rephase specific capital budget items and to write off capital underspends in 2009/10 and to approve specific capital budget items in the 2010/11 capital programme.

The Committee Administrator for this meeting is Col Spring who can be contacted on 01225 394942.

Agenda Item 8

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

CABINET

Wednesday 3rd March 2010

The decisions contained within these minutes may not be implemented until the expiry of the 5 working day call-in period which will run from 5th to 11th March. These minutes are draft until confirmed as a correct record at the next meeting.

PRESENT:

Councillor Francine Haerberling – Leader of the Council
Councillor Vic Pritchard – Adult Social Services and Housing
Councillor Terry Gazzard – Development and Major Projects
Councillor Charles Gerrish – Customer Services
Councillor Chris Watt – Children's Services

71 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair was taken by Councillor Francine Haerberling, Leader of the Council.

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

72 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure as set out on the Agenda

73 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Councillors Malcolm Hanney and David Hawkins.

74 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

There were none.

75 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR(PERSON)

There was none. The Chair announced her intention to consider item 15 of the agenda after all the other items.

76 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

There were 5 questions from the following people: Councillor John Bull, Councillor Tim Warren, Councillor Marie Longstaff, Councillor Bryan Organ, Councillor Nicholas Coombes.

[Copies of the questions and responses, including supplementary questions and responses if any, have been placed on the Minute book as Appendix 1 and are available on the Council's website.]

77 STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

There were none

78 MINUTES: WEDNESDAY 3rd February 2010

On a motion from Councillor Francine Haerberling, seconded by Councillor Charles Gerrish, it was

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 3rd February 2010 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair

79 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS NOW REQUISITIONED TO CABINET

There were none.

80 CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS REFERRED BY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BODIES

There were none.

81 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS PUBLISHED SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING (Report 11)

The Cabinet noted the report.

82 REVENUE & CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING, CASH LIMITS & VIREMENTS – APRIL 2009 TO JANUARY 2010 (Report 12).

Councillor Paul Crossley made an *ad hoc* statement in which he expressed the view that the Council should take the opportunity to deal with the problem of Car Parking income by doing a proper analysis and feeding it into the budget process.

Councillor Francine Haerberling, in proposing the item, said that the recession was making it difficult to predict car park usage. She referred to the fact that £300k of the projected underspend was being transferred to meet the shortfall in car parking income.

Councillor Charles Gerrish seconded the proposal and agreed with Councillor Crossley's remarks but said that the Council was addressing the issue in the current budget and was planning far more rigorously than in the past.

Rationale

The report is presented as part of the reporting of financial management and budgetary control required by the Council.

Other Options Considered

None.

On a motion from Councillor Francine Haerberling, seconded by Councillor Charles Gerrish, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To ASK Strategic Directors to continue to work towards managing within budget in the current year for their respective service areas, and to manage below budget where possible by not committing unnecessary expenditure, through tight budgetary

control;

- (2) To NOTE the reported revenue budget position;
- (3) To NOTE the Council's capital expenditure position in the financial year to the end of January and the year end projections;
- (4) To AGREE the proposed revenue virements;
- (5) To NOTE the changes in the capital programme;
- (6) To APPROVE the additions to the 2010/11 Capital Programme;
- (7) To AGREE the allocation of £300,000 from the Recession Reserve to Customer Services to help offset the impact of the recession on income budgets.

83 BATH & NE SOMERSET LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT REFRESH 2010/11 (Report 13).

Councillor Paul Crossley made an *ad hoc* statement and explained that he would have preferred to have seen a complete list of the LAA targets showing where the Council was on target, where behind target. He was very unhappy that the government was still changing targets, 2 years into a 4-year LAA. He asked for an indication of progress towards earning the reward grants.

Councillor John Bull made an *ad hoc* statement supporting the targets but asking for a clear indication of commitment. As an example, he referred to the fact that bus fares continued to rise while reliability deteriorated, despite the work done by the Council. He also felt strongly that the withdrawal of Home to School Transport could hardly be said to support the LAA target to improve the life chances of young people.

Councillor Francine Haerberling, in proposing the item, said that the refresh was only a light touch refresh and that no fundamental changes were being made.

Councillor Vic Pritchard seconded the proposal. He referred to paragraph 5.5, which listed 6 indicators with outstanding baselines. In some cases, this was because a new cohort was being used and the approval of the government was being awaited. He was pleased to say that the baseline for NI149 (adults receiving secondary mental health services being in settled accommodation) had that day been agreed with central government.

Councillor Charles Gerrish expressed sympathy with Councillor Bull's comments about bus services. He was pleased to say that he would be meeting with First Bus the next day, along with Cabinet members from partner authorities.

Councillor Chris Watt assured Councillor Bull that the Council did not merely pay lip service to the needs of looked after children; he outlined a number of ways in which very real improvements had recently been achieved for looked after children.

Rationale

The Local Area Agreement is a statutory agreement that sets out the priorities for the locality and identifies targets over three years. It is a key performance framework for the delivery of the Council Corporate Plan and the Sustainable Community Strategy, as it acts as a three year delivery plan.

Other Options Considered

None.

On a motion from Councillor Francine Haeberling, seconded by Councillor Vic Pritchard, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To APPROVE the refreshed draft of the Local Area Agreement for Bath & North East Somerset;

(2) To AGREE that the Chief Executive will sign the Local Area Agreement on behalf of the Council.

84 ECONOMIC STRATEGY FOR BATH & NE SOMERSET 2010-2026 (Report 14).

Ian Bell (Executive Director of the Bath Chamber of Commerce and Initiative) made a statement welcoming the broad direction of the proposals. He asked however for more detail about how the proposals would work out in practice and how they would be made to deliver the intended improvements to the local economy.

Councillor Paul Crossley made an *ad hoc* statement in which he pointed out the difficulty of engaging with the MOD over their sites which might become available for redevelopment. He appealed to the Leader of the Council to press for a meeting with government to make the point that the MOD should work with the Council to plan the redevelopment of any land released by the MOD. He also said that the Cabinet should work to encourage independent traders and small groups into Southgate, in addition to the large chains which currently occupied much of the centre; and that the Cabinet should work actively to support community High Street areas.

Councillor Terry Gazzard, in proposing the item, noted the comments made by Ian Bell and by Councillor Paul Crossley. He promised to respond to both in due course. The aim of the strategy was to create a more productive economy by 2026 and the best areas for growth would be the creative, knowledge-based, technology and IT areas. Alongside this, there would be continued support for the area's tourist and retail activity.

Councillor Chris Watt seconded the proposal. Like Ian Bell, he felt that the critical issue was how the strategy would deliver the improvements it intended. He observed that two things would be required: space to grow (which must be encouraged by planners); and skills (which must be encouraged at the level of training). Given that the Council would imminently take over the role of the Learning and Skills Council, there would be an ideal opportunity to prioritise the allocation of funds to those courses which would support the economic aims of the area.

Councillor Charles Gerrish said that he was concerned that the report made assumptions about the level of growth which might not be realised. He therefore proposed an additional clause to the recommendations which would take account of levels of growth as these became clearer. The amendment was accepted by the proposer and seconder.

Rationale

The Economic Strategy is the action plan for taking forward the Economic Development & Enterprise theme of the Council's Sustainable Community Strategy. It is based on statistical evidence drawn from reputable sources and anecdotal evidence collected from the business community and by expert public and private agencies. The action plan will be the basis for future work done by Council services, particularly the Economic Enterprise and Business Development team within Development and Regeneration.

Other Options Considered

None.

On a motion from Councillor Terry Gazzard, seconded by Councillor Chris Watt, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To SUPPORT the overall principles contained within the economic strategy;

(2) To SUPPORT the action plan contained within the economic strategy.

(3) To AGREE that the policy will be reviewed by Cabinet once the position regarding the level of economic growth becomes clearer.

[Clause (3) of the resolution was added as an amendment proposed by Councillor Charles Gerrish which was accepted by the proposer and seconder of the substantive motion]

85 ECONOMIC DOWNTURN – COUNCIL RESPONSE UPDATE (Report 16).

Councillor Paul Crossley made an *ad hoc* statement welcoming the paper and saying that he had found Appendix 2 particularly clear and helpful. He asked for more detail about two items appearing in Appendix 1: "Meet the Buyer" and "Loss of Fee Income".

Councillor Francine Haerberling proposed the item and said that Councillor Crossley's points would be addressed by Andrew Pate (Strategic Director of Resources).

Councillor Charles Gerrish seconded the proposal.

Andrew Pate explained that the loss of fees related to car parking receipts.

Councillor Terry Gazzard said that the Meet the Buyer events were meetings of the Council and local business. One event was held in Midsomer Norton and one in Bath.

Rationale

The report provides an update in relation to use of the recession reserve and proposed future uses; and the impact of the recession on the local economy, local communities and the Council and local actions.

Other Options Considered

All of the proposed actions are optional except those already in place to ensure there is a prudent approach inherent in the Council's budgets.

On a motion from Councillor Francine Haerberling, seconded by Councillor Charles Gerrish, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To APPROVE the allocation of the remaining balance within the recession reserve to offset income shortfalls resulting from the recession, and to delegate this to the S151 officer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources and the Chief Executive;

(2) To NOTE the contents of the update report and request that this be taken into account in services planning and future work of Overview & Scrutiny Panels.

86 WEST OF ENGLAND DELIVERY & INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT FRAMEWORK 20120/11 TO 2019/20 (Report 15).

Councillor Paul Crossley made an *ad hoc* statement in which he asked for information on progress made with the Homes and Communities Agency; and said that the proposals before Cabinet appeared to be yet another example of recreating Avon by another name. He observed that the Council had an excellent track record of delivering projects, so should offer its expertise to the West of England Partnership in preference to setting up a duplicate regional project management operation.

The Leader sought an assurance from all Cabinet Members that they had read the Public Interest test paper and considered the factors for withholding and disclosing appendices a to O, marked exempt. It was then moved by Councillor Terry Gazzard, seconded by Councillor Charles Gerrish and

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE that appendices A to O contain exempt information falling within paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 because they contain information relating to the financial or business affairs of a particular person (including the authority holding that information); and that having applied the public interest test it is considered that the public interest is best served by withholding the information.

Councillor Terry Gazzard, in proposing the main item, said that the proposed framework was the result of detailed and complex negotiations. It sought to coordinate investment in housing and jobs. All 3 of the locations proposed by this Council had been accepted for inclusion in the Framework – Bath City Riverside, Somer Valley; Somerdale and Keynsham.

Councillor Charles Gerrish seconded. He said the proposals were about where the investment would come from, not so much about delivery. It was a sub-regional way of attracting investment from central government. He welcomed the recognition that some areas of Keynsham were in need of inward investment.

Councillor Francine Haerberling responded to the point made by Councillor Crossley by saying that the West of England Partnership was not recreating Avon – its effect was to enable the Council to make its arguments to government with the authority of the whole region instead of as a relatively small authority. She understood some of the reservations but felt that the proposals were the only way forward.

Rationale

The West of England Delivery and Infrastructure Investment Framework will provide a framework for attracting and enhancing public and private investment in housing and jobs in the sub-region. It will set out a clear prioritised strategic framework within which the house building industry, registered social landlords and national agencies can plan for the future.

Other Options Considered

None.

On a motion from Councillor Terry Gazzard, seconded by Councillor Charles Gerrish, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(2) To ENDORSE the West of England Delivery & Infrastructure Investment Framework 2010/11 – 2019/20 subject to an annual review of delivery and priorities through the West of England Partnership Board;

(3) To ENDORSE the 2010/11 Delivery & Infrastructure Investment Plan concluded with the Homes & Communities Agency.

The meeting ended at 5:55pm

Chair(person) _____

Date Confirmed and Signed _____

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

Bath & North East Somerset Council
Cabinet Single-Member Decisions
 published 26-Feb-10 to 9-Jul-10

**Agenda
Item
Number**

11

Further details of each decision can be seen on the Council's Single-member Decision Register

| Date Reference | Title | Decision Maker/s |
|-------------------|-------|---------------------|
|-------------------|-------|---------------------|

Cllr Charles Gerrish

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| 15-Feb-10 | Local Plan - Extension of Saved Policies beyond Oct 2010 | CG |
| E2045 | | |
| <i>The Cabinet Member agreed the list of saved policies with one amendment</i> | | |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 10-Mar-10 | Various Roads, Bath (Designated Car Club Bays) TRO | CG |
| E2109 | | |
| <i>The Cabinet Member agreed the proposals as advertised, with the exception of Canterbury Road, Kennington Road, Triangle East and Vane Street where alternative locations will be investigated and subject to further proposals</i> | | |

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| 01-Apr-10 | Use of Commuted Sums to cover future Highway Mtce Liability | CG |
| E2074 | | |
| <i>The Cabinet Member agreed that Commuted Sums be secured from developers in respect of 'nonstandard' and 'extra-over' features resulting from developments, forming part of the public highway, in line with the advice set out in the County Surveyors Guidance Document</i> | | |

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| 07-Apr-10 | Various Roads Camden Residents Pkg, 1-Way and Wtg TRO | CG |
| E2067 | | |
| <i>The Cabinet Member agreed to introduce the residents parking scheme as advertised with the exception that the times be reduced to 8am to 7pm; that the proposals in relation to the one way streets be withdrawn; and that the no-waiting proposal be subject to further consultation and if necessary re advertised</i> | | |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 07-Apr-10 | Wiltshire 2026 - Consultation on Core Strategy | CG |
| E2084 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed the response to the consultation on Wiltshire Council's 'Wiltshire 2026' document</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|--|---|----|
| 07-Apr-10 | Vol Org Funding Applications - Built Heritage & Environmental | CG |
| E2088 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed the recommended allocation of funding, together with a clear indication to groups that future funding cannot be guaranteed although the Council will endeavour to comply with the Compact Code of Good Practice on Funding</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|----|
| 13-Apr-10 | South Road Car Park Midsomer Norton | CG |
| E2093 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member decided to close the existing vehicular entrance to Excelsior Terrace car park; to create an entrance access into South Road car park to join both car parks; to lock the existing gate at South Road car park at 9pm each evening and open at 7am each morning; and to create a coach stop on South Road.</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|--|---|----|
| 19-May-10 | Comments on Planning Policy Statement - Low Carbon Future | CG |
| E2143 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed the response to the consultation, with minor amendments of clarification in response to comments he had received</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|----|
| 10-Jun-10 | Gullock Tynning Skate Park | CG |
| E2066 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed to adopt the proposals on the grounds of safety</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| 10-Jun-10 | Award of new contracts for Supported Bus services | CG |
| E2122 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member made a decision relating to the provision of supported services. The full decision can be seen on the Council's website.</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 29-Jun-10 | Outer Bath Residents & Controlled Pkg Zone 1 Variation TRO | CG |
| E2126 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed that the scheme should be implemented</i></p> | | |

Cllr Chris Watt

| | | |
|---|------------------------------------|----|
| 15-Mar-10 | Fostering Allowances Annual Review | CW |
| E2070 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed that there would be no change in fostering age related allowances or related allowances for permanence, savings, and supported lodgings; and noted that current levels of therapeutic fostering fees and care leavers maintenance are linked to local government salary scales and Job Seekers Allowance respectively</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| 18-Mar-10 | Council Duties in respect of Private Fostering Arrangements | CW |
| E2056 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agrees that the duties and responsibilities of the Local Authority in respect of private fostering arrangements have been implemented in accordance with the legislation</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------------|----|
| 22-Mar-10 | School Term & Holiday Dates | CW |
| E2089 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed the School Term and holiday dates</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 04-May-10 | Alteration of Lower of Age Limit at Castle Primary, Keynsham | CW |
| E2121 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed to publication of the necessary legal notice on 27th May 2010 for alteration of the lower age limit at Castle Primary school by the addition of Early Years provision to commence on 1st September 2010</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 01-Jun-10 | Youth Offending Team Inspection Improvement Plan | CW |
| E2123 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed that the improvement plan fully addresses the recommendations set out in the Inspectorate's report; and that the improvement plan can be submitted to HMI Probation</i></p> | | |

Cllr Francine Haerberling

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 01-Mar-10 | Transfer of Responsibilities from Learn & Skills Council to LA | FH |
| E2094 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed the proposals to establish a sub-regional Shared Service to undertake the commissioning of 16-19 Education and Training</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| 02-Mar-10 | Alice Park Tea Chalet - Variation to allow sale of alcohol | FH |
| E2059 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed the changes to the lease with safeguards</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 13-May-10 | Guildhall Christmas Market 2010 - 2012 | FH |
| E2118 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed to allow the GMTA to hold a market in the Guildhall Car Park concurrently with the 2010, 2011 and 2012 Christmas Markets (plus additional days for setting up and dismantling), subject to certain specified conditions</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 26-May-10 | VolOrg Funding - Community Transport 2010/11 | FH |
| E2119 | | |
| <p><i>The Leader agrees the funding proposals and that officers be given delegated powers to reallocate funds, in consultation with the Leader, from approved projects that become unviable, should such situations arise during the year</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| 07-Jun-10 | Combe Down Stone Mines - Reinstatement of Firs Field | FH |
| E2133 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agrees that the wall should be constructed on the line of the existing boundary fence</i></p> | | |

Cllr Malcolm Hanney

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| 22-Feb-10 | Treasury Management Monitoring Report to 31-Dec-09 | MH |
| E1993 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member accepted the treasury management report to 30th December 2009</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|--|---|----|
| 11-Mar-10 | Approval of Information Management Policies | MH |
| E2090 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed the policies</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|--|---------------------|----|
| 14-Apr-10 | Agresso 5.5 Upgrade | MH |
| E2062 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agrees that the Agresso 5.5 upgrade is included in the capital programme commencing 2010/11</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|--|-------|
| 25-Apr-10 | Adoption of Play Area at Greenvale Drive, Timsbury | MH/CG |
| E2106 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Members agreed that the ownership of the play area be transferred to the Council and that, once transferred, the Council take over the future responsibility for maintaining the area transferred</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| 07-Jun-10 | Bath Transport'n Package - Objections to Land Appropriation | MH |
| E2075 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member noted the objections and decided that the land at Kaynton Mead and Rudmore Park would be appropriated for the purposes of highway use under the Highways Act 1980 in connection with the Bath Transportation Project</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|---|-------|
| 28-Jun-10 | Customer Services Cap Proj -Windsor Bridge MOT Centre | MH/CG |
| E2114 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Members approved a capital budget of £60,000 for the introduction of MOT facilities at Windsor Bridge Depot, Bath</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|--|------------------------|----|
| 05-Jul-10 | Single Equality Scheme | MH |
| E2145 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed to adopt the single equality scheme on behalf of the Council</i></p> | | |

Cllr Terry Gazzard

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| 01-Mar-10 | Grants to Voluntary Arts Organisations 2010-11 | TG |
| E2014 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed the Voluntary Sector Arts Grants</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|----------------------------------|-------|
| 06-Mar-10 | Public Realm & Movement Strategy | TG/CG |
| E2030 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet members agreed the proposed responses, actions and amendments; and approved the Public Realm and Movement Strategy (as amended) for publication as Council policy</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| 15-Mar-10 | Vol Org Grants - Museums and Heritage 2010-11 | TG |
| E2108 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed the revised grant-aid criteria; and agreed the grants to be awarded</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------|----|
| 05-May-10 | Bath Festivals Contract 2009-11 | TG |
| E1833 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed to award a two-year contract to Bath Festivals Ltd for the financial years 2009-2011 for delivery of the services specified in the contract</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------|----|
| 24-May-10 | Resourcing of Future Bath Plus | TG |
| E2141 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet member agreed that the Divisional Director for Tourism, Leisure and Culture will act as the Chief Executive of Future Bath Plus and report to the Chairman of the company for all items relating to the interests of the FBP Board; and that the Council's Arts Development Team work programming will be influenced by the Future Bath Plus</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|----|
| 23-Jun-10 | Arts Development Stgy 2011-14 | TG |
| E2009 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed to adopt the policy</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| 01-Apr-10 | B&NES Housing & Wellbeing Strategy 2010-2015 | VP |
| E2120 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed that the Council/NHS Housing and Wellbeing Strategy 2010-2015 can be adopted and published</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------|
| 07-Apr-10 | Response to OS Rvw of Home Care | VP/MH |
| E2065 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Members responded to the Panel's recommendations</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| 07-Apr-10 | Exceptional Case Circumstances - Housing Renewal Policy | VP |
| E2110 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet member agreed that funds in the form of an interest free Council loan would be allowed to enable essential works to be carried out and leave the house free from the most serious hazards</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|--|---|----|
| 21-Apr-10 | Joint Complaints, Compliments and Concerns Strategy | VP |
| E2132 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed to adopt the strategy on behalf of the Council</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|---------------------|----|
| 04-May-10 | Get Active Strategy | VP |
| E2136 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed to adopt the Get Active Strategy on behalf of the Council</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|----|
| 25-May-10 | Local Lettings Plan - Southgate Bath | VP |
| E2135 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agrees to approve the local lettings plan for this Somer Community Housing Trust scheme</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| 28-May-10 | Fairer Contributions for Non-Residential Social Services | VP |
| E2134 | | |
| <p><i>The Cabinet Member agreed that the single Fairer Contributions Policy for Non-Residential Social Care Services be adopted for use in relation to all new users of nonresidential social care services from May 2010 and that Option Three outlined in the full report be implemented</i></p> | | |

This page is intentionally left blank

| Bath & North East Somerset Council | | |
|--|--|---|
| MEETING: | Cabinet | |
| MEETING DATE: | 21 July 2010 | AGENDA ITEM NUMBER 12 |
| TITLE: | A Review of Secondary Schools in Bath | EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE: E 2097 |
| WARD: | All | |
| AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM | | |
| List of attachments to this report: | | |
| Appendix 1 – Summary of consultation responses | | |

1. THE ISSUE

- 1.1. In March 2008 Council approved a strategy for the future of secondary schools in Bath & North East Somerset. In May 2008 Cabinet agreed to consult on proposed changes to some Bath schools specifically the closure of Culverhay (boys), Oldfield (girls) and St Mark's C of E schools and a linked proposal to open one new co educational school in the north of the city and one new co-educational school in the south of the city.
- 1.2. A public consultation exercise on this proposal was undertaken between March and May 2010 and this report sets out the results of the consultation.

2. RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet agrees to:

- 2.1. Support the proposed federation of St Mark's C of E school on its current site with St Gregory's Catholic College, with joint Post 16 provision for both schools. Invite the two schools to proceed with this hard federation so that it is in place for 1 September 2011.
- 2.2. Support Oldfield school in seeking to become a **co-educational** academy and obtain written confirmation from the Head and the Governing Body by Friday 17 September 2010 that co-educational status has been included in the school's Application to Convert to an Academy sent to the Secretary of State, with the intention that it will become a co-educational academy by 1 September 2012.
- 2.3. If written confirmation that co-educational status has been included in the school's Application to convert to an Academy by 1 September 2012 is not received by Friday 17 September 2010 the LA to commence a competition to invite proposers to submit bids for a new 160 place co-educational 11-18 school on the existing Oldfield school site and to propose the closure of Oldfield school and the opening of a new co-educational school on 1 September 2012.
- 2.4. Consult on the proposal to close Culverhay school.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1. The impact of any decision will depend on the specific details of the decision and the resultant number of pupils attending Bath & North East Somerset schools.
- 3.2. Revenue funds are provided to the LA based on the number of pupils attending schools within the LA. The allocation known as the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is a ring-fenced grant that has to be spent on schools or services supporting schools under regulations laid down in the Education Act 2003.
- 3.3. The current DSG allocation per pupil (2010-11) is £4,203 per pupil. Funding allocations to schools average approximately £3,850 leaving £350 per pupil used on services supporting schools.
- 3.4. The principles of school funding are that if a school is closed then funding will follow the pupils to whichever school they attend. So if the pupil numbers attending Bath & North East Somerset schools were to remain the same the overall, DSG would remain the same whichever schools the pupils attend. However if pupil numbers were to fall then there would be a subsequent reduction in DSG.
- 3.5. As the purpose of the review is to remove surplus places and provide more co-educational places it is anticipated that there will not be an overall reduction in the number of pupils attending schools in Bath and North East Somerset. Parental choice may result in higher or lower number of pupils attending our schools as a result of any decision on school provision. As described earlier any reduction in pupil numbers would result in a proportionate reduction in resources being provided to the LA as part of the Dedicated Schools Grant.
- 3.6. All schools are funded through the Local Management of Schools (LMS) formula. If any school were to be closed approximately £150k of funding for fixed cost elements of the formula would be saved and could be re used to target at priorities by the Schools Forum. Some schools also receive additional resources in their formula funding for specific items like Curriculum protection which supports a school to provide a wide ranging curriculum when its pupil numbers are small. Small secondary schools receive approximately £200k under this factor, and again these resources would be released to support other priorities if a small school were to be closed. Culverhay and St Marks are small schools.
- 3.7. There would be ongoing capital maintenance costs of keeping three schools open, this would limit any possible improvements at schools as capital resources are restricted in coming years. If a school were to be closed this would reduce the ongoing maintenance costs of the schools estate as a whole. If Schools become academies their capital requirements are not met by the Local Authority.
- 3.8. The capital resource implications are linked to the site sale of any school to be closed. Any receipt from the sale of the site would under current council policy be ring-fenced for investment in the school estate. It is estimated that the Culverhay school site could release approximately £6m-£8m. However a conservative approach to any building projects out of this resource would be followed. As projects at any school converting to a co-educational establishment will be required prior to the release of capital from the sale of any other site, it will be necessary to plan the borrowing requirements into the use of any resource resulting from a site sale.

3.9. The cost of essential work to convert Oldfield school to add co-educational facilities would be approx. £1-1.5m. Further work on improving facilities would also be considered as part of these alterations.

4. CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- *Improving life chances of disadvantaged teenagers and young people*
- *Improving school buildings*
- *Sustainable growth*
- *Addressing the causes and effects of Climate Change*

5. THE REPORT

Background

- 5.1. In Jan 2007 the Children and Young People Overview & Scrutiny Panel completed a review of all our secondary schools. The Panel visited each school to see the facilities available to young people and staff in each school. They also held open public contributor sessions where the views of head teachers, governors, local councillors and the local community were heard.
- 5.2. The purpose of the review was *'to ensure that the current high standards in our secondary schools are maintained and improved; that all our resources are used effectively; that, wherever possible, good facilities are available to all users of school buildings; that the natural choice of parents and pupils will be their local school; that travel to schools by private car should be reduced where possible'*.
- 5.3. Following consideration of the findings of the Panel, full Council and Cabinet in 2008 agreed a strategy for secondary schools in Bath & North East Somerset and officers were authorised to consult on changes to secondary schools in Bath. Officers were also asked if possible to gain early access to Building Schools for the Future (BSF) funding to enable major capital investment to renew and remodel secondary schools in line with any proposed changes. In 2009 it became apparent that Bath & North East Somerset was unlikely to gain early access to BSF funding due to the economic downturn leading to uncertainty about the future of the programme. However, as capital investment would be possible from the sale of a surplus school site it was decided to proceed with consultation and publication of a notice and to use the proceeds from the sale of land following a school closure to invest in the remaining schools.
- 5.4. The public consultation was launched on 28 March and ran for two months. Approximately 13,000 copies of a consultation document setting out the issues and key challenges in Bath were distributed to parents at all Bath secondary, primary and special schools. Copies were also sent to all other schools in Bath and North East Somerset, ward members, local MPs, neighbouring local authorities and other stakeholders such as the Catholic and Anglican dioceses, parish councils and community groups and organisations using Culverhay, Oldfield and St Mark's C of E school sites. A copy of the consultation document can be found on the Council website http://consultations.bathnes.gov.uk/consult.ti/bath_review/consultationHome. People were invited to respond using the detachable pro forma in the document, by email and letter or on line through the Council website.

- 5.5. Public consultation meetings were held at Culverhay, Oldfield and St Mark's C of E schools with an additional meeting at the Guildhall for those unable to attend one of the school meetings. Every attempt was made to ensure that the meetings could accommodate those wishing to attend, including the provision of overflow areas with both an audio and visual link so that people could see and hear the presentations by officers and the schools. Approximately 500 people in total attended the public meetings. A summary record of the public meetings has been provided to Cabinet.
- 5.6. Since the launch of the consultation in March there have been developments which may impact on the proposals that were consulted on and the options available to Members. The new Government is taking forward legislation that will enable a greater number of schools to become Academies outside local authority control, with those judged outstanding by Ofsted able to be fast tracked to achieve Academy status subject to agreement by the Secretary of State for Education. Two schools involved in this consultation Culverhay school and Oldfield school have indicated that they are seeking Academy status with Oldfield school as an outstanding school aiming to achieve Academy status as soon as legislation has been passed.
- 5.7. During the consultation period St Mark's C of E school announced that it is proposing to federate with St Gregory's Catholic College with a shared Post 16 provision. Federation can be proposed by two or more schools at any time and does not require statutory consultation or publication of a statutory notice prior to implementation.

Implications of proposed Government legislation – Academies Bill

- 5.8. Schools judged outstanding by Ofsted can be fast tracked possibly enabling them to become Academies immediately after the new Academies Bill is in place in autumn 2010. Oldfield which is an outstanding school has announced that it will seek approval to become an Academy and remain a single sex girls school.
- 5.9. The Council supports the Academies agenda and has made it clear that it has no objection to schools becoming Academies. However, if Oldfield school became a single sex girls Academy this would prevent the Council delivering its plan for Bath and would reinforce a pattern of provision which the review and consultation process has identified does not currently meet the needs of parents and children across the city. Parents in the Weston and Newbridge area have expressed a strong desire for a co-educational school 'in this part Bath'. If the Secretary of State for Education were to approve a single sex academy this would deny the majority of local parents the type of school that they wish.
- 5.10. Recent guidance from the Department for Education on the application process for schools wishing to become Academies states that where *'schools wishing to convert that are already part of a local reorganisation the Secretary of State will want to review the merits of each case before making a decision'*. The Council and local MPs have already made representations to the Government office for the South West and the Secretary of State for Education, providing details of the Council's agreed strategy and consultation process and expressing concern about the potential impact of the proposal by Oldfield school to become a single sex academy.

5.11. The guidance also states that new academies must admit pupils wholly or mainly drawn from the area in which the academy is situated. The term 'area' is not defined.

Key challenges in Bath

5.12. As set out in the consultation document, although standards in our schools in Bath are good overall the city of Bath area has some particularly complex issues:

5.13. Parents and carers in surveys in 1999 and 2004 identified that they want more co-educational places with approximately 60% of parents preferring co-educational (boys and girls educated together) schooling for their children. Currently only 40% of places are co-educational.

5.14. Four of the seven schools are single sex. Of the remaining three schools, two are Voluntary Aided Church schools. This leaves a choice of only one school, Ralph Allen school, for those parents/pupils who wish for a co-educational, non church school.

5.15. The seven schools have a total of 5,545 places available for pupils aged 11-16 but only approximately 4,800 pupils go to these schools and therefore there are around 750 unfilled places in Bath secondary schools, mainly in St Mark's C of E school and Culverhay school.

5.16. Approximately 4,000 of these 4,800 pupils live in Bath and the surrounding villages (including approximately 80 per year group pupils from a much wider area attending St Gregory's Catholic College as their nearest Catholic secondary school). Approximately 800 pupils travel into Bath every day to these schools; the largest number being girls attending Oldfield school from South Gloucestershire and Bristol.

5.17. Because schools are funded mainly on a per pupil basis, small pupil numbers can create financial problems for small schools and make it difficult to provide a sufficiently wide range of specialist teachers and subjects.

5.18. The total number of pupils, even with increased numbers of pupils expected to be generated from new housing developments, will only be enough for six secondary schools for the foreseeable future.

5.19. Every secondary school in Bath has some buildings which are in poor condition and need improvement. Maintaining the correct number of schools and places will mean that resources for repairs and maintenance can be used as efficiently as possible.

The plan for Bath is aimed at addressing the key challenges set out above and proposes

5.20. A reduction in the total number of schools from seven to six to remove surplus places and reflect the current and future need in Bath.

5.21. A reduction in the number of single sex places and the provision of more co-educational places to meet parental demand.

5.22. Creating the right size schools which are educationally and financially secure.

5.23. The provision of sufficient Church school places to meet the level of demand.

5.24. Maintenance of one single sex girls school and one single sex boys school to provide choice for parents.

5.25. To have one new co-educational school located in the north of the city and one new co-educational school in the south.

Key issues arising from consultation

5.26. In total 13,000 copies of the consultation document were issued with 619 replies received. Appendix 1 provides a summary of the responses to the consultation questions and the relationship of respondents to the schools.

5.27. The consultation document asked parents and other consultees the following questions:

1. Do you agree with the Council's overall plan/strategy for Bath (as set out above)?
2. Do you agree with the proposal to close Culverhay, Oldfield and St Mark's schools and to open one new 11-18 co-educational school with a planned admission number of 160 in the north of the City and a linked proposal to open one new 11-18 co-educational school with a planned admission number of 160 in the south of the City?

5.28. As can be seen from Appendix 1 a significant majority of respondents support both the overall plan for Bath (72%) and the closure of Culverhay, Oldfield and St Mark's C of E schools and the opening of two new schools (66%).

5.29. More responses were received from parents/carers of pupils at St Mark's Co of E school and Oldfield school than Culverhay school but the largest number (72%) were from parents/carers of primary school pupils who would enter secondary education in future years. Of these 76% are in favour of the proposal.

5.30. Those linked to St Mark's C of E school expressed strong support for the continuation of a church school on the St Mark's C of E school site reinforcing earlier parental surveys which confirmed a demand for church school places. Consultees felt that the school served its local community and it was essential that there was a school located in the North East of the city.

5.31. Travel difficulties arising from the potential for either Oldfield or St Mark's C of E schools to close was a concern as the schools are located at the extreme North West and North East of Bath respectively. Should one of these schools close parents were concerned that pupils living in these areas would be required to travel long distances in order to attend school, adding to the existing difficulty in moving around the city and compromising the Council's stated carbon reduction policy.

5.32. Supporters of Oldfield school questioned the proposal to close an outstanding school. (OFSTED judged 2003 "Very Effective" and 2007 "Outstanding").

- 5.33. Parents of primary aged children living in the Weston and Newbridge areas supported the provision of a new co-educational school on the Oldfield school site as currently there is no co-educational option in this area and particularly a lack of options for boys living in this area.

Admissions arrangements

- 5.34. It is necessary to consider the admission arrangements that would accompany any proposals to change the number and location of schools in Bath. The current pattern of admissions where six of the seven schools have the same basic catchment - the Greater Bath Consortium (GBC) area (the seventh school, St Gregory's Catholic College has a wider catchment area) works very well. In addition the use of First Areas within the GBC for rural areas (Ralph Allen school - South East of Bath and St Mark's C of E school - North East of Bath) protects those children in outlying rural areas that might otherwise be disadvantaged due to distance. In the last two years over 90% of parents have received their first preference choice of a secondary school in the city. It would therefore be proposed to continue this pattern.
- 5.35. There are clear advantages of not having specific catchment areas within the city which parents may feel are unfair. Evidence in other parts of the country reveals they can lead to house purchases to obtain places in precise catchment areas.
- 5.36. If the decision is taken to close a school then the GBC area would apply to the remaining six schools with distance from the school being a key criterion after looked after children and siblings attending the school.
- 5.37. Should Oldfield school be closed and no co-educational school be provided on the Oldfield site then children from the upper Weston area in particular would have a long journey to school (Culverhay; St Mark's; Hayesfield and Beechen Cliff schools) and may have limited choices as children living closer to those schools would have priority places on distance grounds. If there were no co-educational school on the Oldfield site it is estimated that about 30 children each year might be disadvantaged and not achieve their first preference.
- 5.38. Should St Mark's C of E school be closed and no co-educational school be provided on the St Mark's C of E school site then children from the Larkhall area in particular would have a long journey to school and may have limited choices as children living closer to those schools would have priority places on distance grounds. If there were no school on the St Mark's site it is estimated that about 15 children each year might be disadvantaged and not achieve their first preference.
- 5.39. Should Culverhay school be closed then pupils from the Twerton and Southdown areas in particular would have a longer journey to school unless they chose a single sex girls school (Hayesfield) a single sex boys school (Beechen Cliff) or a Catholic school (St Gregory's). If there were no school on the Culverhay site and Oldfield school was a co-educational school it is estimated that less than 10 children each year might be disadvantaged and not achieve their first preference.

Key factors to consider

- 5.40. When Members are considering the proposals set out in the recommendations they will need to consider whether they address the key challenges in Bath as set

out above, whether they reflect the views expressed through the consultation and the level of support for individual schools.

a) The extent to which the proposals will contribute to improving educational standards.

5.41. As part of the consultation exercise a proposal was received from the Chairs of Governors at St Mark's C of E school and St Gregory's Catholic College and the Directors of Education at the Diocese of Clifton and the Diocese of Bath and Wells for St Mark's C of E school and St Gregory's Catholic College to form a hard federation. This proposal would retain two distinct schools but create a single governing body from September 2011 with one headteacher. St Gregory's Catholic College is an Outstanding school (OFSTED 2008) and became a National Support School in 2009, recognised as having the ability to work with and raise standards in other schools. A hard federation between the two schools has every potential to significantly raise standards at St Mark's C of E school.

5.42. Oldfield school was judged by OFSTED to be outstanding in 2007. The leadership and management were judged to be "outstanding and the school's capacity to continue to improve was judged as "outstanding". Oldfield school is well placed to raise standards further were it to become a co-educational school. The Governing Body and the Headteacher have stated on a number of occasions that Oldfield school would be willing to become a co-educational school. Should Oldfield school become a co-educational school it has the potential to meet the needs of all the boys and girls from West and North West Bath area and become an outstanding co-educational school.

b) The extent to which the proposals maintain Choice and Diversity and meet parental demand for co-educational and church places

5.43. As stated in section 5.13 major surveys conducted in 1999 and 2004 together with this consultation all reveal the demand for more co-educational school places in the City of Bath. The proposal to retain a co-educational Anglican Secondary School on the St Mark's C of E school site through a hard federation with St Gregory's Catholic College and provide a non-denominational co-educational school on the Oldfield school site would both increase co-educational places and maintain the balance of church school places.

5.44. Together with the four schools to be retained, Hayesfield school and Beechen Cliff school (single sex girls and boys schools), Ralph Allen school (co-educational) and St Gregory's Catholic College (co-educational), this would provide an excellent range of schools providing parents with a genuine choice of schools of different types.

c) Degree of support from parents and wider stakeholder for the proposals.

5.45. As set out there was considerable support for the overall plan for Bath although consultees understandably differ in their views as to how this can be best achieved.

5.46. The proposals reflect the consultation responses by recommending the retention of church places through the continuation of St Mark's C of E school for which

strong support was expressed. The proposed federation with St Gregory's Catholic College provides the potential to build on this high level of support.

5.47. The high level of demand from parents of primary aged children supporting a co-educational school in North West Bath site would be met by either Oldfield school becoming a co-educational school or co-educational academy or the provision of a new co-educational school on the Oldfield school site via a competition.

d) Whether the proposals will lead to a more effective and efficient use of resources

5.48. A reduction in the number of schools would lead to a more efficient use of resources through savings in both revenue and capital funding. As set out in Section 3 the closure of a school would provide £150k approximately of fixed cost revenue savings. The closure of Culverhay school would provide an additional £200k saving through the small school support element proving a total of £350k which could be used to benefit other schools with priorities to be agreed with the Schools Forum.

5.49. The Government has recently announced it is halting the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme which removes prospects of building new schools in Bath & North East Somerset. Future levels of other capital funding from government are also almost certain to be significantly less than previous years. Children's Services in line with all Council departments will also face revenue budget reductions impacting on the capacity to borrow to fund capital. In these circumstances the already considerable backlog of schools planned maintenance e.g. roofs, windows, and boilers is likely to increase with only highest priority essential work being done. This will mean that necessary but less essential maintenance will not be possible with consequent deterioration in those areas of the buildings with a risk that some parts of buildings become unfit for purpose. Retaining more schools than are necessary will in time increase the overall level of essential maintenance required at a time when funding is reducing. A reduction in the number of schools through the closure of Culverhay school would reduce the level of maintenance required and provide a capital receipt of £6-8m a proportion of which could fund the essential works required to provide more co-educational facilities and the balance may fund additional improvements.

e) Extent to which the proposals enable young people to access a local school and reduce travel across the city

5.50. The proposals for the six schools to be provided through this consultation would provide a pattern of schools that is able to best meet the needs of the majority of pupils in the City of Bath (see also sections 5.34 to 5.39 covering Admissions issues).

5.51. Currently Hayesfield school (girls) and Beechen Cliff school (boys) have a City-wide catchment and enable the majority of pupils 1st preference in Bath to gain places at these schools. This would continue as at present. Similarly, St Gregory's Catholic College would continue as at present meeting the needs of catholic pupils from a wide area, including the City of Bath. These three schools would cater for approximately 400 pupils drawn from across the whole city.

5.52. The remaining three schools (Ralph Allen school and two co-educational schools on the St Mark's C of E and Oldfield school sites) would serve specific areas of

the City. The most isolated areas of the City and its surroundings (the rural area towards Freshford and Batheaston and the urban areas of Larkhall and Upper Weston) are best served by schools in these three localities. This would reduce the distance travelled to school and the number of pupils taking journeys across the city, especially if these schools were high performing and popular and greater numbers of pupils living in each of these areas chose to attend their local school rather than travel to a school that is further away. The Twerton and Southdown area would continue to be served by Oldfield school and Hayesfield school (all girls living in this area currently attend schools outside the area) and boys would be able to attend Oldfield school (co-educational), Beechen Cliff school, Ralph Allen school, or St Gregory's Catholic College or St Mark's C of E school if a church school was preferred. It is anticipated that as more pupils choose their local school rather than travel greater distances to other schools as at present, places will become free in Beechen Cliff school and Ralph Allen school that could be occupied by pupils from the Twerton and Southdown area.

- 5.53. If a co-educational school were to be provided on the Culverhay school site this would provide easy access for children in the South West of the City but would result in long journeys to school and restricted choice for either the Weston area or Larkhall area (depending on whether a school was provided on the Oldfield school site or St Mark's C of E school site).

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 6.1. The report author and Lead Cabinet member have fully reviewed the risk assessment related to the issue and recommendations, in compliance with the Council's decision making risk management guidance.
- 6.2. Oldfield school have stated that they would like to become a co-educational school. Funding (initially £2 million) is available to make modifications to the buildings to accept boys (approximately 50 in Y7 in the first year of becoming a co-educational with additional numbers of 11 year olds in each subsequent year). However there is a risk that Oldfield school will request substantial building modifications costing in the region of £10m and therefore will not proceed to becoming a co-educational school or academy. In this case the only course of action would be closure and a competition to run a new co-educational school.

7. EQUALITIES

- 7.1. An equalities impact assessment has been carried out and reviewed by the Lead Cabinet Member
- 7.2. The proposals will continue to provide single sex places at centrally located schools providing equality of access and meeting parental demand. An increase in the number of co-educational places and the retention of church places will ensure choice and diversity.

8. RATIONALE

- 8.1. There are 5,545 places available for pupils aged 11-16 in the seven secondary schools in Bath. However, only approximately 4,000 pupils living in Bath and the surrounding villages (including approximately 400 pupils from a much wider area attending St Gregory's Catholic College as their nearest Catholic secondary school) attend these schools. Despite an additional 800 pupils attending Bath

secondary schools from outside Bath and North East Somerset, there remain around 750 unfilled school places in these seven schools. The majority of these unfilled places are in Culverhay school and St Mark's C of E school with a smaller but significant number at Oldfield school.

8.2. Therefore, in order to ensure the effective use of resources, provide schools with sufficient pupils to maintain a broad and balanced curriculum with a range of options and to raise standards only six secondary schools are required.

8.3. The consultation responses have revealed strong support for the strategy to reduce the number of schools from seven to six.

8.4. In order to maintain choice and diversity and to meet parental preferences it is important to maintain both single sex and co-educational provision and church and non-church school places. Therefore it was proposed to retain one single sex boys school (Beechen Cliff) one single sex girls school (Hayesfield) a co-educational school (Ralph Allen) and a Catholic secondary school (St Gregory's Catholic College). This strategy was also well supported by the consultation responses (71%).

8.5. In order to maintain the balance of church school places and also to provide more co-educational places a further two schools need to be provided. Due to the difficulty and cost of obtaining land for a secondary school in an urban area such as Bath existing school sites need to be used.

8.6. It is proposed that these two schools should be:

1. An 11-18 Anglican Faith School on the St Mark's C of E school site. The key factors in reaching this conclusion are:

- The Diocese of Bath and Wells already owns this land and there is already an 11-18 school on this site;
- The hard federation proposed by St Mark's C of E school and St Gregory's Catholic College and supported by the Dioceses of Bath and Wells and Clifton has every potential to significantly raise standards at St Mark's C of E school and increase the number of pupils on roll;
- There is strong support from the local community for a secondary school on the site;
- The long and difficult journey for a significant number of pupils if there were no school in North East Bath (particularly from the Larkhall and Lambridge areas). The journeys to school and traffic across the city would be reduced if local children were to attend the school on this site.

2. An 11-18 co-educational school on the Oldfield school site. The key factors in reaching this conclusion are:

- The current school with a 192 Planned Admission Number is able to provide sufficient co-educational places on the site;
- Modifications to the buildings can be undertaken within a budget of approximately £1.5m to enable both boys and girls to attend the school;

- Oldfield school is already on “Outstanding” school (OFSTED 2007) and the Governing Body have expressed a desire for the school to become a co-educational school;
- There is very strong demand from local parents for a co-educational school on the site, particularly from parents of primary age pupils;
- A co-educational school on this site would reduce the journeys to school and traffic across the city if local children were to attend the school.

8.7. These decisions would however mean that a consultation on the proposal to close Culverhay school with no new school on the Culverhay site would need to be carried out. If the decision was made to close the school with no new school on the site, careful consideration would need to be given to the impact of this on pupils and staff at the school and on the local community. If Culverhay school was to close, the pupils from the area could be accommodated in the six remaining schools throughout the City.

8.8. Currently a large number of boys from the Culverhay school area attend Beechen Cliff and Ralph Allen schools. They would continue to be able to do so with boys also able to attend Oldfield school if it were to be a co-educational school.

8.9. Currently all girls from the Culverhay school area gain places at Oldfield, Hayesfield and Ralph Allen schools. They would continue to be able to do so.

8.10. Catholic children (boys and girls) from the Culverhay school area gain places at St Gregory’s Catholic College and they would continue to do be able to do so.

9. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

9.1. Other options were considered and evaluated against following key criteria;

- How they would contribute to improving educational standards
- The extent to which they maintain choice and diversity but meet parental demand church and co-educational places
- Whether they reflected the views in the consultation including the level of support for individual schools.
- Whether it will lead to a more efficient use of resources
- Whether proposals would enable young people to access a local school and reduce travel across the city.

Option 1

Close Oldfield school and close St Mark's C of E school. LA run a competition to open a new 160 place co-educational school on the Oldfield school site (The Diocese may seek an exemption from running a competition and consult on the proposal to open a new C of E school on the Oldfield school site or on the St Mark's C of E school site or propose a C of E school on the current St Mark's C of E school site in the competition).

With a linked proposal to close Culverhay school and LA run a competition to open a new 160 co-educational school on the Culverhay school site.

This was the proposal set out in the consultation paper. This option could provide more co-educational places at Oldfield school or St Mark's C of E school and if a school were on the Oldfield school site meet parental demand for co-educational places in North West Bath and provide more co-educational places in South West Bath on the Culverhay school site. However closure of Oldfield or St Mark's C of E schools would provide only one school serving North Bath which is a major concern of parents due to travel difficulties as these schools are at the extreme North West and North East of city respectively. It could also mean the loss of church places which consultation has confirmed are still required and valued by parents if the Diocese was not successful in obtaining an Exemption or was not the winner of the competition. Finally, the closure of one of these schools could be detrimental to educational standards as Oldfield school is an outstanding school and St Mark's C of E school through the proposed federation with St Gregory's Catholic College has an opportunity to raise standards. Preserving a school on the Culverhay school site which although co-educational may not be as attractive to parents as other options available.

Option 2

St Mark's C of E school remains open on its current site federated with St Gregory's Catholic College.

LA run a competition to open a new 160 place co-educational school on the Culverhay school site and then a notice to close Culverhay school.

Linked proposal to close Oldfield school.

This option has, through the proposed federation of St Marks' C of E school and St Gregory's Catholic College, the potential to raise standards and would meet the demand for church places. It would provide a good choice for parents in South West Bath through a co-educational school on the Culverhay school site. However it would mean the closure of Oldfield school as an outstanding school and would remove the potential for Oldfield school to become a co-educational school or academy. Also it would not provide co-educational places in North West Bath contrary to the wishes of parents, and could lead to pupils from the area not getting any of their first choice alternative schools through distance criteria in the admissions process.

10. CONSULTATION

10.1. *Ward Councillor; Cabinet members; Parish Councils; Trades Unions; Overview & Scrutiny Panel; Staff; Other B&NES Services; Service Users; Local Residents; Community Interest Groups; Youth Council; Stakeholders/Partners; Other Public Sector Bodies; Section 151 Finance Officer; Chief Executive; Monitoring Officer*

10.2. Extensive and wide reaching consultation on the school re-organisation proposals for Bath were undertaken between March and May 2010. This included a consultation document circulated to a range of statutory consultees to include pupils, parents and carers of existing pupils and of local primary age pupils, school staff - both teaching and non-teaching, ward councillors, local MPs, Catholic and Anglican dioceses, trade unions and neighbouring authorities. Local

public consultation meetings were held at each school with an additional meeting for those unable to attend the school meetings.

11. ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN REACHING THE DECISION

11.1. *Social Inclusion; Sustainability; Human Resources; Property; Young People; Corporate; Impact on Staff; Other Legal Considerations*

12. ADVICE SOUGHT

12.1. The Council's Monitoring Officer (Council Solicitor) and Section 151 Officer (Divisional Director - Finance) have had the opportunity to input to this report and have cleared it for publication.

| | |
|--|---|
| Contact person | Chris Kavanagh 01225 395149 |
| Sponsoring Cabinet Member | Councillor Chris Watt |
| Background papers | Consultation document – 'A Review of Secondary Schools in Bath' |
| Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format | |

A Review of Secondary Schools in Bath

Appendix

Review of Secondary Schools in Bath

Questionnaire Summary Results

This page shows the summary of the responses that have been received.

1

Do you agree with the Council's overall plan/strategy for Bath which is to:

- Reduce the number of schools from seven to six to remove surplus places and reflect the current and future need in Bath.
- Reduce the number of single sex places and provide more co-educational places to meet parental demand.
- Provide sufficient Church school places to meet the level of demand.
- Maintain one single sex girls school and one single sex boys school to provide choice for parents (Beechen Cliff and Hayesfield).
- Create the right size schools which are educationally and financially viable.
- Have one new co-educational school located in the north of the city and one new co-educational school in the south of the city.

| Option | Count |
|---------------|--------------|
| Yes | 72% (302) |
| No | 28% (116) |

2

Do you agree with the proposal to close Culverhay, Oldfield and St Mark's schools and to open one new 11-18 co-educational school with a PAN of 160 in the north of the City and a linked proposal to open one new 11-18 co-educational school with a PAN of 160 in the south of City.

| Option | Count |
|---------------|--------------|
| Yes | 66% (275) |
| No | 34% (143) |

Either 2a

A new school on the current Culverhay site and a new school on the current Oldfield site.

Please see attached.

Or 2b

A new school on the current Culverhay site and a new school on the current St Mark's site.

Note: The current St Mark's site could be the location for a new school only if it was a Church of England school proposed by the Anglican Diocese.

Please see attached.

a

Parent/carer involved with:

| Option | Count |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| Culverhay | 4% (14) |
| Oldfield | 12% (44) |
| St Mark's | 11% (40) |
| Other (including Primary and Special) | 72% (255) |

b

Pupil at:

Option

Culverhay

Oldfield

St Mark's

Other (including Primary and Special)

Count

6% (3)

19% (9)

10% (5)

65% (31)

c

Member of staff at:

This question has been answered 41 times.

d

Governor at:

This question has been answered 33 times.

e

Member of the community near:

This question has been answered 109 times.

f

Other (please specify and state school(s) name)

This question has been answered 35 times.

Name

This question has been answered 418 times.

Postcode

This question has been answered 418 times.

| | |
|----|---|
| 2a | A new school on the current Culverhay site and a new school on the current Oldfield site. Comments: |
| • | No. there should be a school on the St Marks site in the north east of Bath. |
| • | The Oldfield site for a school would still attract pupils from South Glos. Children in Batheaston/Bathford/Bathampton/Swainswick would find it difficult to travel that far across town. |
| • | This sounds like the better option. However, there is quite a lot of snobbery in Bath about the area where Culverhay is and I wonder if people will actually choose to use a school based there? |
| • | This would be my preferred option |
| • | I would support this option, if Oldfield Girls school remains open, either as a girls school or a co-ed school, either under control of the LA or as an Academy. The priority is to provide a secondary school in the north western area, serving local children, where travel times and cost do not dictate that parents will have to drive their children to school. |
| • | A new co-educational school on the Oldfield site would attract more families from Bath and therefore reduce the options available to cross-border residents in the rural areas of South Glos. |
| • | This is the correct option, assuming the only options are the St Marks or Oldfields current sites, as there should be fewer church school places. |
| • | Saving Oldfield school is the main priority!!!! K |
| • | Why do they have to be new schools, keep the same name, keep the same uniform and add a few toilets/changing rooms? |
| • | Adapt Oldfield to co-ed, rather than close and start new school. What a complete waste of money that would be! Save the school, keep the teaching staff and headteacher. New school at Culverhay would be a good idea. |
| • | This would be the best option as Oldfield takes in pupils from Weston Village and surrounding villages. Oldfield also has an outstanding OFSTED report, so why close such a good school. Not all parents want their child to attend a faith school. |
| • | This is the option we would favour of the two, but either option would substantially improve the situation. |
| • | It is clear that the current school on the Oldfield site serves the children of Bristol. There isn't the desire to attend from the children of Bath. |
| • | Oldfield site as non denominational important |
| • | If the schools are to change way not build on the Oldfield and st marks sites? There are a lot of schools located in and around by culverhay school. |
| • | I think the consultation here has just proved slightly biased... It should say there are ways of how a new school to the North West of the City could be provided. We (the Consultation team) suggest..... Suggest what you have put is not that legally correct, and could be subject to judicial review |
| • | Not single sex |
| • | There is no need for a new school on either site. |
| • | Put a new school anywhere you like but not at the Oldfield site. |
| • | I support this option as Culverhay is well located to serve Southdown, Twerton, Rush Hill and parts of the more central areas and has ample space for redevelopment. A new school at the Oldfield site is a preferable alternative to a new building on the St Mark's site. The current St Mark's site is too small to accommodate a modern school and has no room for expansion. |
| • | Not the Culverhay site. |
| • | Definitely no |

| | |
|---|---|
| • | The other locations seem better. |
| • | No I would strongly object to Oldfield being amalgamated. It would dilute and alter the constructive community that it has striven to create |
| • | Culverhay and Oldfield both need updating and modernising but should remain single sex. |
| • | Yes, Oldfield is in a good location set in lovely grounds. |
| • | I would prefer option (a) as I feel this would give the best deal to children in Bath. |
| • | Should these plans go ahead I would prefer the 'a' option as the journey too and from school for the current girls at Oldfield MUST be considered. |
| • | Option 'a' would be preferable to me if it meant my daughter would be able to continue her schooling at the Oldfield site. It would be less disruption for her at a crucial time, as she would looking at starting her G.C.S.E. courses, and disruption at this time could reduce her ability to obtain a good grade. |
| • | Either BUT if option 'a' I would only like this if one of the schools is a Church School. NB. If Culverhay had been a CofE school of good standard I would ahve chosen this for my children instead of Ralph Allen. |
| • | I believe option 'a' above would be the best way forward. |
| • | Oldfield Park site not very central. |
| • | oldfield site but single sex |
| • | No. For those of us living in the north of the city this would defeat the purpose of having a good co-ed neighbourhood school. The edge of Weston is definately not accessible for those living around Lansdown, Fairfield Park and Larkhall. Even though the headmistress at Oldfield Park talks of their high marks and why the school shouldn't be closed down, there is not doubt that this is not a true Bath school, with so many pupils from Bristol. Better to put it to good use as a college. |
| • | There is no need for a new school on the Oldfield site as there is a perfectly good one there already. Closing St Marks would leave the North East corner of Bath without a nearby state secondary school. |
| • | I would agree to a new school bing build on the Oldfield site, however I do not agree with closing of the Schools. |
| • | A new school on the Cuvlerhay site is what I wish for as it the school within a mile from my home. The other new school I don't really mind what site it's on. |
| • | Option A - Wider scope to develop sport facilities (essential with Government targets of 80% 2hrs curriculum plus 1 hour extra curricular per week). |
| • | Neither option chosen. Why & at what cost? How much has this consultation period already cost. No doubt the legal proceeding will also be expensive and that is before you start any building, improvement or reorganisation. How much does it cost to send all these forms out to every household. You are already wasting mone NOW!! |
| • | In future years this may be required but the pupils currently attending these school should see their time out before any changes are made & future intake could chose knowing what lies ahead for them. |
| • | Why put Oldfield with two of the boy's schools who are so under achieving. |
| • | This options makes sense in respect of re-building capabilities, St Marks has very limited area in which to provide as many on-site facilities, eg sports pitches, as Oldfield. |
| • | neither as oldfield should stay as it is. If it does go though oldfield site as my daughter will still beable to get to school on a bus from the area we live in as i have the understanding she will still have a place in a bath school. |
| • | I agree this seems the most sensible solution. Both sites have enough space to expand in future. |

| | |
|---|---|
| • | Oldfield site is currently a Major Existing Developed Site in the Green Belt - planning policy allows for limited infilling and/or redevelopment for educational use as long as it does not have greater impact on openness than current development. This would need to be taken into account in developing a new school. |
| • | Conditional on the school(s) being co-educational and secular, I agree with the proposals. |
| • | This would be our preferred option as we want a non-denominational, co-ed school for our child. |
| • | A new school on the Oldfield site, replacing like for like in regard size & single sex, as most BSF schemes would be ideal. You should do nothing that changes the fantastic ethos & standards that Oldfield achieves. |
| • | I would favour option A. Both sites are big with good facilities. |
| • | We feel 'a' would be the best and most convenient plan as Oldfield is on a big site with room for expansion as is Culverhay. |
| • | 'a' would be my choice as they are easily accessible and I do not believe we need a church school. |
| • | I just hope and pray that if this does happen, then one of the new school's will be built on the Oldfield site because my daughter travels from Bristol, and I do not want her travel time to be any longer than what it is now. It would be ridiculous for our daughter to have to travel right into Bath. |
| • | Culverhay re-development seems good idea, good location etc. |
| • | this would be preferable as oldfield school would be far more convenient |
| • | I agree with this proposal |
| • | Don't know which site in the north is better, other than away from South Glos to stop our money being spent on kids from other authorities. |
| • | I support 2a PROVIDED that the new school on the Oldfield site can be a Church of England school. |
| • | Only if Culverhay received significant funding to be able to serve the community eg Academy status Would favour this option |
| • | This may be the best choice to ease traffic from the other side of Bath. |
| • | No preference |
| • | The oldfield site is too far out for many families. |
| • | I don't want this exercise to go ahead but if it does I feel Oldfield would be the better site as it is easy to get to, has lots of space and is relatively flat. |
| • | Would it be possible to have one of these schools as a Church of England school? |
| • | I do not agree with the opening of a new school on the current Oldfield site as the mapping tool used in the consultation amply demonstrates that the two main catchment areas are south of Bath and outside the BANES areas. It is difficult to imagine that demand from South Glos/Bristol will decrease whereas those parents wanting a co-ed school to the south of Bath will have one on the Culverhay site. |
| • | If a school north of the river is not going to be re-opened, I think it should be Oldfield as it takes many students from outside Bath, and many children in the catchment area of Bath, do not go there. |
| • | Given the location of St Mark's and the additional permissions, this would seem the best option. However, faith schools have been shown to perform very well and provide a more supportive environment. Could not the CofE have a stake in new developments to balance that of the RC? |
| • | This would be my preference. I am the mother of two primary school-aged boys and would welcome a co-ed school on the Oldfield site which would be within walking distance of our home in Newbridge. At present, my children have no senior school that is part of our |

| | |
|---|--|
| | community - their closest school is Beechen Cliff, which is a 45 minute walk or expensive bus ride away. |
| • | This is the only viable option for a variety of reasons including the lack of coed places in the south of the city and also the fact that the Culverhay site serving the more disadvantaged ward in the city. Not having a school on the Culverhay School site would caused further issues for the most disadvantaged ward within the city. |
| • | One in north of city, one in south. |
| • | This is the only proposal we support as a non religious co-ed school on the Oldfield site will have strong support and ties with the surrounding community which the current Oldfield School does not achieve. |
| • | Because of my location I would hope that this option would be achieved. |
| • | Don't believe this would solve the percieved problems. |
| • | Yes. This would be my preferred choice as Oldfield is within easy walking distance of our home. |
| • | Oldfield is a large site with amazing facilities. The LA has forced Newbridge Primary to have an intake of 90 pupils in 2010, this must indicate a local increase on population. It would therefore make sense to retain the nearest secondary school and make it co-ed. |
| • | No because there will be no school on the north east of Bath |
| • | Irrelevant now that Oldfield has taken itself out of the equation with its tactical survival of Academy status application. |
| • | I do not agree with this proposal because of the impact on traffic in the city and the inconvenience to the public. |
| • | No. Oldfield does not meet the needs of children from the community in Bath - hence the overwhelming majority of pupils from outside our community. |
| • | This will mean a long distance for children to travel across Bath when congestion is already great at rush hour |
| • | This would be my preferred option due to the proximity of the Oldfield site to our home. The reliance on gaining the approval of the CoE for the St Marks site is also a concern. |
| • | This is preferable. |
| • | Reading what has been announced in the news recently, it looks like Oldfield has taken themselves out of the consultation by going to Academy status. Even though this is underhand of the headmistress, I can't say I blame her, considering the outstanding results of this school. As we our geographically placed in Larkhall. It would mean a car journey to send our children . There is no direct bus link to either of Culverhay or the Oldfield site. t |
| • | Definitely oldfiels site there is nothing on our site and children have to cross town in cars and buses, it will lesson the traffic. |
| • | this will be deemed redundant if Oldfield becomes an academy and there is no longer a co-ed school in the North to send our children to |
| • | This is the only option within these proposals that allows for viable schools |
| • | I think the consultation meeting on 25/5/10 highlighted how passionate the parents are within Newbridge/Weston and Larkhall areas about having secondary schools within their community. There was no support for Culverhay at the meeting from either parents at Culverhay or Primary Schools within that area so this indicated that this school isn't the most popular school. |
| • | Preferred choice out of two but local community really wants to keep Oldfield for area and make co-ed. |
| • | Yes, Oldfield is already a successful school and should converted to a coed school. The fact that it is so popular with families from outside BANES is a good thing: they can continue to fill any remaining places after every child in the area has been allocated a place, keeping |

| | |
|---|---|
| | surplus places to a minimum. |
| • | I would much prefer the option described as 2A for travel purposes. I also think the Oldfield site is a better choice than St Marks, which is sloping and in an area which is not particularly accessible for transport. |
| • | I agree with this statement as I live in Weston and would be served by the conversion of the Oldfield site. This would serve several feeder primary schools, reduce congestion in Bath city centre and provides a large, attractive school site. |
| • | My own personal preference is that Oldfield School is retained or closed and re-opened as a co-educational school and that the Council commits investment to achieve that outcome. |
| • | What about a church school in the north of the city? The south has St. Gregory's, st. Mark's should remain in the south. |
| • | Oldfield is a MUST for Newbridge / Weston children. Culverhay needs modernising. |
| • | http://consultations.bathnes.gov.uk/consult.ti/bath_review/answerQuestionnaire?qid=1053987 |
| • | Oldfield School would be a great location for a new school as currently the majority of students are from outside the Bath area (i.e. Bristol). Boys in Bath NEED a school north of the City. |
| • | The Oldfield site is key to most families in this area. It is pleasant and convenient for a population which is miles from most of the other options. But it takes far too many pupils from nearby Bristol boroughs and I do not understand why this is allowed to happen? |
| • | Oldfield is set in a wonderful position. Being on the edge of town it eliminates traffic congestion. The peaceful surroundings, I am sure, aid education, in creating a tranquil and airy feeling. Also it is on a direct bus route. Therefore keeping traffic and pollution down as less parents need to use cars to get their daughters to the school. I believe cars would be required to get to St Marks. |
| • | This option would require all pupils from Larkhall to travel across the city - this will cause traffic mayhem. There is no direct bus service from Larkhall to Weston, and services from Lambridge to Ralph Allen are already overcrowded. |
| • | Oldfield would be more appropriate as they have better (especially sports) facilities so less money would have to be spent on improvements |
| • | If this question is still relevant (ie Oldfield have not actually had improval to become an academy) then i agree with this statement fully. With these schools being Co-ed. Please also see my notes above. |
| • | This questionnaire is pre-supposing that a co-ed school in the north and the south is the way forward. |
| • | As far as I'm concerned this is not an option as children in the north of the city will not have access to these schools without awkward commuting. This is too much to ask for 11-year-old children. Haven't you noticed that Bath has a transport problem? At the moment First-Bus are planning to cut services to Larkhall. As for walking to school, forget about it, it's really not a safe option without enforced 20 mile hour speed limits and the closure of commuter rat runs in the north of the city. |
| • | My understanding is that Oldfield are going out of ths system anyway |
| • | Both schools should remain and be co-ed with admissions policies which prioritise the children of Bath and the immediate surroundings (ie discourage those currently attending Oldfield from Bristol - a situation which discourages Bath children from attending there). |
| • | I do NOT agree with this proposal. |
| • | This is no good for children on the north eastern side of Bath - many of whom opt for wiltshire to get the "best quality" education. |
| • | 1.If a school is to be shut, the bulk of poorer kids come from around the Twerton area, and so could access a school on the Oldfield site far more easily than one on at St. Marks. Giving as |

| | |
|---|--|
| | many as possible of those with least educational opportunities at home the best choices of schools should be a priority, so Oldfield is better for more. |
| • | Considering the size of local mixed primary schools including Weston All Saints and Newbridge this seems the most logical proposal. |
| • | This is my preferred option although I am partly influenced by selfish motives. The school would remain local to us. Having said this, there would be no money raised directly from the sale of the ST Marks sight although I understand the church could choose to invest in either of the other two schools. |
| • | I agree with this one there should be atleast one church of england secondry school. |
| • | i am in favour of this option providing oldfield will be a co-educational, and available to children in bath over south gloustershire/bristol. mainly as the school is in the bath city boundary. |
| • | This would be our preferred option. |
| • | As Oldfield have refused to cooperate in this procedure I find this idea wholly unacceptable. Oldfield does not want to or has any aspirations to serve the community of Bath let alone the north side of the city nor does it wish to be co-ed. So that means my child who is a boy will not be served by this decision and would have a 2 bus journey to get to the other schools , which is ridiculous since he can walk to school now. |
| • | Not quite - Oldfield must be a co-ed site even if it to become an academy. |
| • | Please see above comment. |
| • | Not in favour of this option. Oldfield is on the edge of the city while St-Marks is halfway between Weston and Bathford. |
| • | This is our preferred option as otherwise for those in Newbridge/Weston area otheriwse our children would be reequred to travel across town to either Culverhay or St Marks. |
| • | As above, given our location this would be our preference |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| 2b | A new school on the current Culverhay site and a new school on the current St. Mark's site. Comments: |
| • | St Marks is a good local school and should be retained and enhanced to improve results and reputation. Retaining a school on the St. Marks site is my personal priority. Out of the two options 2 b is my preference but the option of 2 schools in the north should be considered |
| • | I would strongly support a new Anglican school on the St Marks site. |
| • | Parents who would choose St Marks today are not doing so because of the threat of closure; this distorts the figures (both intake and achievement levels) because many of the more able pupils or those with more proactive parents are sending them to schools known not to be under threat. St Marks has made incredible progress in recent years, has strong links in the community and has delivered outstanding performance for the education and development of my own children. |
| • | Yes. St Mark's may be small but it works. It has a special atmosphere. |
| • | I do not agree that the new school should be a religious school of any kind. See also my answer to Q2. |
| • | I would want 2b a church school on the st marks site and one on the current Culverhey site. It is important to keep a school on the st marks site for those families around that site and the surrounding places like Batheaston. |
| • | I would support a proposal for a Church of England school either on the current St Marks site or a new school north of the river. This would continue to meet the need for sufficient church school places. |
| • | This option would leave anyone in the Newbridge/Weston area with little or no local provision. Children would find it much harder to get in Beechen Cliff and Hayesfield and St Marks and Culverhay are a long way to travel and do not have the same outstanding results which Oldfield has. |
| • | Whilst I disagree with the closure of any of these sites for the reasons listed above, I also very strongly support the maintenance of a school on the St Mark's site. I am a local resident with 2 primary age boys who are actively engaged with St Mark's and its pupils already. Larkhall and the surrounding area is a very strong community and the school plays an active part in this. |
| • | The dusty old Church is desperate to appear relevant by maintaining a hold on our schools and on children's minds. We cannot permit this to continue. The Church must be separated from all state schools. |
| • | In order to meet the criteria to provide Church of England school spaces, this option is the only possible one. |
| • | There should be fewer church school places so this option should not be adopted. |
| • | Education should not have to bow to religion, if we had a large Muslim population would the St Marks site be used for their school. |
| • | No. See previous comments about the outdated view that church schools are needed/wanted. |
| • | I think option 2b would be a bad idea. |
| • | The St Mark's site would be a more convenient site for our location. It may be difficult for children to travel from the Fairfield Park/Larkhall part of Bath to the Oldfield site without using a car. |
| • | The consultation meeting at St Marks on May 12th showed the support of the community for a co-educational Faith based school that respected non-religious members of the community (such as my family). I would like to thank the Chair and |

| | |
|---|---|
| | speakers at the meeting for the informative way in which they conducted the debate. It should also be noted how the St Marks staff and local Heads contributed so positively to the debate and how apparent it was that they put the interests of students first. |
| • | There is a great need for a co-educational school to serve both the immediate locality, and the wider community. Primary schools in the locality would provide children. A new school on the same site could provide a first class education for those areas of Bath that have, up until now, been neglected. As a parent, I find the lack of co-educational schools very frustrating. We are a co-ed society..Let's have a great new school for this side of Bath-a legacy for future students. |
| • | Will this mean renovation or demolish and total new build? and if so how long will this take? |
| • | I am of the opinion that the new 'north' school should be on the St Marks site since it would be closer to a large residential area and is already co-ed and therefore should not require high expenditure for the implementation of this plan. Further having now attended one of the consultation meeting I am more convinced than before that Oldfield should be the school to be closed. |
| • | I take it that St Mark's has now moved to North of the City As there are only max 500 characters in 3 below Q 3St Marks is really by itself geographically (5 stars)and is in a highly residential area (5 stars). We need to be local and support local schools. Minimise the school run taking pupils way across the City centre and return at night. Suggest cross Town from B'easton to C'hay would take 30 mins one way,ie i hours car emissions, pm journey same 2hrs emmissions at 30mph 9kg /day/car. |
| • | One new school either side of the City would be fair. |
| • | Not single sex |
| • | This would be a cynical way for the Council to make money by selling off the valuable and attractive Oldfield school grounds. I suspect this is why the scheme has been suggested. |
| • | Culverhay's 'design' is appalling,there is no cohesion. The blocks are too spread out; classrooms are too small and too old; there are no redeeming features and the layout is a maze for bullying, so do with it as you please. Bulldozing it is the only realistic option. |
| • | Not the Culverhay site. |
| • | Morally opposed to shurch schools, but the locations of St Marks and Culverhay would seem to give a better spread of secondary schools across Bath. Is there any other site possible in the St Marks area? |
| • | This would be preferable, but I m not convinced that it would achieve what is proposed |
| • | New schools on the Culverhay site and the St Mark's site are more likely to benefit children from the Bath area, which is surely the object of the exercise! |
| • | In light of the above, St Mark's is not a suitable site. |
| • | I would choose (b). I think it is important to keep one school on the East side of Bath (St Mark's site)(would avoid traffic moving through Bath City Centre) as most schools already on West side. As a CofE school is needed anyway, it is not an issue that it had to be CofE on that site. If Oldfield used, pupils would have to cross Bath City Centre to get to it every day. |
| • | Neither see over. |
| • | Is this likely to happen. If not then there will be no CofE faith school (whre is parent |

| | |
|---|--|
| | choice then?). It is my understanding the St Mark's site was inaccessible during poor weather/snow and forced to close. Is this a good option. NO. |
| • | Do think there will still be a need for a Church of England Secondary School ie 'b' St Mark's site. |
| • | Would oppose school at St Mark's site as Bath doesn't need any more schools with faith based Admissions. Perhaps somewhere more central than Larkhall would be better for Northside? |
| • | The St Mark's site is much better for good geographical spread of schools. It is needed to keep kids from that area battling through London Rd traffic, much better to keep them at school up near Larkhall. Sell the Oldfield girls site - it must be worth a fortune. |
| • | Option b. |
| • | st marks |
| • | Yes. Ideal solution for those of us who would like a CofE co-ed neighbourhood secondary school. |
| • | Leave St Mark's alone! |
| • | It would be incomprehensible to close a highly successful school and keep an undersubscribed school open. |
| • | I would go for (b), there is much more need for a secondary school in north (east) of town. |
| • | A school is needed either on the St Marks site or Oldfield site as there a numerous schools near Culverhay. |
| • | a - is the preferred option as there are too many faith schools in Bath already! |
| • | Idea B - I believe as these 2 are in better positions across the City of Bath. Transport concerns me, traffic is already bad in Bath, therefore it would be better if children are able to walk to the new schools. |
| • | However, this option makes sense in respect of location, St Marks is located within a more densely populated area, with Oldfield being on the outskirts of town, and attracting more children from other LA Areas. We already have alot of buildings on the edge of town and a school in this location would increase traffic as more people would need to travel to this school rather than walk/cycle. |
| • | The st Mark's site is not suitable for a new modern school as this is in the middle of a residential area on a steep hill. |
| • | St. Mark's site is too small to sensibly accommodate the scale of school envisaged for the north of the city whilst allowing for full and adequate playing pitch/open space provision. In addition it is very inaccessible for students coming from outside B&NES - students will continue to attend from South Glos for at least 5 years after the new school is developed. |
| • | I oppose this option as it would mean maintaining a church school. |
| • | Prefer option b. If option a is chosen there would be a shortage of schools on the north and east sides of Bath. |
| • | Agree to a new school on the existing Culverhay school site & St Mark's school sites. |
| • | As to Oldfield or St Mark's. I hope the decision will look to available spare facilities and access as well as 'faith' school provision. Though personally I would like to see a CofE linked senior school. |
| • | 'a' seems much more viable regarding location and building age and size. |
| • | Oldfield site has more space than St Marks & would seem rational choice. There would have to be a linked in transport policy (?? lanes etc). |

| | |
|---|---|
| • | Definitely option 2b - St Marks should be the site of a new Church school |
| • | Its a shame that religion has to be involved in education at all. |
| • | I support the proposal for a Church of England school on the St Mark's site |
| • | If the Oldfield site cannot be made a Church of England school, then I support 2b. |
| • | We support the proposal for a C of E school at St Marks |
| • | I support the Authority's proposal for a Church of England school on the St Mark's site |
| • | I would thoroughly support the St Mark's site being used for a Church of England school as being complimentary to St Gregory's. |
| • | Would favour St Gregs taking on co-demoninational status if not new school on the St Marks site |
| • | I would support the provision of sufficient church school places in the city by supporting the proposal for a Church of England school on the St Marks site |
| • | I support the provision of sufficient church school places in the city by supporting the proposal for a Church of England school on the St Marks site. |
| • | I agree with this. |
| • | I favour this proposal. Why not take the financial contribution the Cof E would make? |
| • | As shown by the report St Marks is very much a school for Bath children with the majority coming from the local area. Its standards year by year are improving, has had a great Ofsted report which shows how well it is performing despite the above average intake of children receiving Free School Meals or with SEN's. With time and support St Marks will become an excellent school. |
| • | We support the provision of sufficient Church school places in Bath and specifically a Church of England school on the St Mark's site. |
| • | 2b |
| • | 2b - to satisfy the need for a faith school, a CofE school on the St Marks site would make the most sense. |
| • | No preference |
| • | I support the location of future secondary schools on the St Mark's and Culverhay sites. |
| • | Would like it to be st marks site but not necessarily a c of e school. |
| • | I would prefer 2b, a new school on the current Culverhay site and a new school on the current St Mark's site, in order to support the provision of sufficient Church of England school places. |
| • | We opt for option 2b. We would like that Church of England secondary school be retained on the current St Mark's site. We think that the children of this generation (and any generation) require a moral compass and spiritual guidance as part of a holistic approach to education. It is therefore very important for us as parents that our children grow up with Christian principles and with Faith in God. |
| • | I agree with 2b as Oldfield School does not serve many students from the Bath area. It is apparently an 'Outstanding' school and yet only 27 parents and students from Bath have chosen it as their first choice. As a Bath residence and Council Tax Payer I believe that we should concern ourselves primarily with the education of BANES students NOT those from other authorities. |
| • | I agree that a new school should be located on the St.Mark's site but there are a number of major concerns (see below) |
| • | St Marks site is easily accessible by walking and cycling for many families and would be the better option. |

| | |
|---|--|
| • | The St Marks site is not big enough, not flat enough and is too difficult to get too being in a crowded residential area. there is already a lack of sports fields and to make it bigger would reduce facilities further. |
| • | I think the new schools should be located at Culberhay site and St Mark's site. There is already another girls school in Bath and what we need is another co-educational school. Also, we need a school on this side of town, which serves the east as well as the north. Though I am not religious, I am not bothered about the school being Church of England. I would prefer Church of England co-ed over secular girls school any day. |
| • | I would support this proposal (2b) |
| • | I favour this if t is the only way |
| • | Yes - best split |
| • | I support this proposal. The mapping information shows a strong existing cluster of pupils within the local Larkhall area. If these pupils were expected to travel to either Ralph Allen or Oldfield then the areas current transport difficulties would only increase. |
| • | I think St Mark's should be the location for a new school. I agree that it should be a church of England school, otherwise there will not be a C of E school in Bath |
| • | I support this proposal above 2a, to ensure sufficient Church school places are provided in the city |
| • | The option that best provides access and amenity, I have no preference to site - perhaps a totally new site might be better. |
| • | 2b would be perfect. A church of England secondary school on the St mark's site. The only faith school available for secondary children in Bath is a Catholic school. This year 154 places out of 160 have been taken by Catholics - many from outside Bath. We need more faith schools! |
| • | This is the Diocesan Board of Education's preferred option. The Board is strongly committed to schools serving local communities and believes schools on the Culverhay and St Mark's sites are best placed to serve local residents and enrich the offering to young people in B&NES through the existing and developing strengths of local community interface. |
| • | I support this option. I think it should be a church of England school and a small school. |
| • | I think this would be fairer and make more sense as it would provide a new co-ed school for both sides of the city and would support the provision of a new co-ed Christian school. Also Oldfield and Culverhay would be too close together geographically. |
| • | I think that the decision not to keep a small school is obviously finance based as they are inevitably more expensive to run. I believe that St Mark's would be able to translate the skills acquired through small classes to larger ones and therefore believe that the best option for children would be to have a C of E secondary school on the current site of St Mark's. |
| • | It is important that a school remains on the St Mark's site, offering a local school for children this side of the river. Traffic getting across Bath, in the morning particularly, is extremely heavy and there is insufficient public transport to allow many children easy access to a school further away. Keeping a school in Larkhall would offer an alternative to long days for children, encourage local children to walk to school and provide an excellent feeder school for local primary schools. |
| • | Why is a new school on the Culverhay site guaranteed?If this is the only choice |

| | |
|---|---|
| | offered by Banes I would opt for 2b. However, the Culverhay site being safe regardless was not made at all clear in our meeting at St Marks. |
| • | support proposal for a C of E school on St. Marks site. |
| • | I support the proposal for a Church of England school on the St Mark's site |
| • | We favour either a new school on the St Marks site or that St Marks be left as it is. If Oldfield does get Academy status for a girls school and you decide to build a new school at Culverhay your proposal would mean that there would not be a single state school place for any Bath boy who lives North of the river this would clearly be a preposterous situation. |
| • | I can walk to this site. To get to Oldfield I would have to get 2 buses and leave an hour earlier each day!!!! |
| • | I agree with option 2b and that St Marks would be a church of England school. I understand that if this proposal goes ahead that St Marks will be improved in size so it can accommodate 160 admissions and that it will also be rebranded. I have been happy with all the proposals I have been informed about regarding a school staying on this site. |
| • | I believe this option makes the most sense. |
| • | I would prefer for the St Mark's school to remain an option and for the necessary resources to be deployed to ensure it attains the high standards reached in other secondary schools in Bath. This would attract parents in the local community to choose St Mark's as a preferred choice. |
| • | Last point under further comments. Read a - f first. Moved to this section as lack of space provided g. Before any decisions are made I would strongly recommend that the councillors who will make this decision (not just the officers) actually go and talk to parents of children at Newbridge and Weston All Saints Primary Schools who will be affected by this to gauge how strongly the community in this area of Bath feels about this extremely important decision. |
| • | This would not be suitable on a number of counts 1) Church of England school make preferential choice of those who are baptised and attend Church of England churches, this would reduce our choice of co-ed schools to Culverhay 2) both school require travelling for my son - he would not be travelling by public transport so would mean a car journey 3) Neither would place my son in his community. |
| • | I hope that Church of England will be in partnership with local communities to enable this to happen on the St Marks site.. I hope this stay in control of the church of England and not be in partnership with St Greogory.As I feel it is a strange mix and would add further confusion to parents in the area. |
| • | I agree with 2b. |
| • | Do not believe that a new church school is needed or wanted. |
| • | This would be my preferred option. Children should be able to go to school where they live and we should be making it possible for as many children to have a good school within walking distance as we can.thus cutting down on all the extra "school run" traffic current policy encourages. |
| • | No. It would be impractical for my children to travel across the city to St Marks and it would not be walking distance either to Culverhay. |
| • | It seems to make no sense to maintain St. Mark's which is not a popular school and is also a C of E school. This would seem to limit choice even further to parents in the north of the city. |
| • | St marks should stay as a small school see first comment. |
| • | A new school on the current St Mark's site makes most sense when the catchment |

| | |
|---|--|
| | areas of both St Marks and Oldfield Schools are examined in detail. With the majority of pupils at Oldfield coming from outside of B&NES it seems odd that Oldfield would be chosen and parents in Larkhall couldn't send their children to a local school! Let's concentrate on B&NES residents first! |
| • | St Marks could have a sixth form as no sixth form exists in North Bath. Existing buildings can be increased by adding extra floors below or above. Children should not waste 2 hours a day commuting to Brislington. Examine St Mark's educational provision and religious emphasis. Parents can be put off schools that over-emphasise religion in the curriculum and the building. It could do with change to make it more educational and less crematorial. |
| • | I agree with this proposal - if it needs to be a Church School then I think that's a great thing for Bath anyway. |
| • | Yes. St Mark's is situated at the heart of a community where there is already a successful primary school. Its geographical location neatly balances that of St Gregory's across the City. Partnership with the Diocese of Bath & Wells is the way to ensure that the wishes of those who want an Anglican secondary school are met. The financial contribution from the Diocese will ease the pressure (albeit slightly!) on the capital outlay. |
| • | Communities in the North of Bath need a secondary school within close reach. St Mark's is in the right spot. |
| • | This will mean a long distance for children to travel across Bath when congestion is already great at rush hour |
| • | I prefer option 2b. |
| • | of course I would prefer The st Marks school to stay, if it were to close it would greatly effect the local community , shops , and as i have already mentioned, impact heavily on the traffic.. We are athiests and wonder, if St Marks could take a more open direction with religion, to make it more attractive to non church goers. this and the proposed consultations is probably why the schools in the North are so oversubscribed. |
| • | No we need school on our area for the same reason. |
| • | "b and the provision on a Church of England school on the site. |
| • | We are not Church of England! The CHOICE is now reduced once again |
| • | The St Marks site is not capable of enlarging and has very poor facilities with little options for expansion. As someone who has more than a keen interest in sport and young peoples health I believe the current facilities at St Marks are totally inadequate. There is nowhere near enough 'outdoor space' for a thriving secondary school and the 'artificial pitch' (as someone who works on artificial pitches) is no better than a car park. |
| • | I have concerns over the families that do not practice religion as they will be disadvantaged in the admissions process and therefore Weston/Newbridge children will be disadvantaged by having limited choices made available to them. The 3 primary schools within this are are extremely well respected and successful please do not let these children down by splitting up the community. |
| • | I support option 2b and understand that the Bath & Wells Diocese has made a clear decision to fully support the retention of an Anglican co-educational secondary school on the St Mark's site. My family are not churchgoers, but we are totally happy with this option and will be delighted to send our sons to an Anglican school on this site, believing that the principles taught are very much in line with our own family ethos. |

| | |
|---|--|
| • | No. St Marks is already a coed school which is failing to attract enough pupils. It is in an inaccessible area of the city for many children. |
| • | I believe it is essential to have a school in the north-east of the city to give people in this area the option of attending a school which does not involve crossing the city. |
| • | By keeping St.Mark's, it would provide an Anglican school in the north, to compliment Catholic St. Gregory's in the south. We have been informed that they would like to enter into a 'hard' federation together, which would be an exciting development for St.Mark's. Allowing the sharing of resources, including a sixth-form, it would surely go a long way towards providing the council with a way of retaining St.Mark's in a far more educationally & financially viable way, than maybe it does currently. |
| • | I support this option. There is also an advantage that the school would be supported by the Anglican Diocese not only by the site being owned by the Diocese, but also a financial contribution to its funding. St. Marks is very much part of the community in Larkhall, students are very involved in lots of community projects. All the schools are set in the heart of this community and if the secondary school was lost it would leave a very big hole in the fabric of this community. |
| • | I object to this option that will result in the closure of Oldfield School. |
| • | It is my understanding that the Anglican Diocese has approved this option. It would be my first choice as the Oldfield site is even more remote than St Mark's. |
| • | I think Bath needs a church of England school. So would vote for the 2b option. |
| • | This option is the most preferable as both these schools serve the local community and should remain and St. Marks, together with St. Gregory's in the south will provide sufficient church schools for the city of Bath. |
| • | I support this option. |
| • | Oldfield school is virtually in Bristol, so it is difficult to get there from this part of the city and neither Culverhay nor Oldfield would constitute a local school for anyone on this side of Bath |
| • | NB We must NOT let the church meddle with our children's education! They are at school to be informed, not disinformed! |
| • | Don't agree with either. Close one single sex school, reopen other as co-ed. If council/LEA continue to ignore this obvious proposal, I'd be forced to opt for 2b as we must have a school on the St Marks site. An improved school would attract greater numbers. Recent discussions with St Gregory's re the development of a 6th form would help refresh St Marks' profile in exactly the way set out in your vision for education, resulting in many more admissions from the surrounding areas. |
| • | I am not in favour of a CofE option and the St Mark's site is too small to achieve a modern education service provision. |
| • | The same transport issues arise in reverse as 2a, and as stated having the only school in the north of Bath as a Church of England school raises issues of choice for parents who may not want their children educated in a religious environment. Even as a regular church goer I personally would prefer to separate education and beliefs so I can understand that for those of different or no faith this could be a big problem. |
| • | The complications of the Church involvement may slow down the process, but as it is already a co-ed school, it already has facilities for mixed pupils |
| • | This I agree with |
| • | i think this is the right choice as there needs to be a school on these sites and the magority of children attending are from the local area NOT BRISTOL |

| | |
|---|--|
| • | I support the option. I feel St Mark's school is in a better position to sever pupils in the north of bath it would be a lot easier for pupils to travel to and from. |
| • | I strongly support the need for a christian based school in Bath and this was one of the reasons my son chose to go to St Mark's school. |
| • | I feel strongly that st marks should remain as a church of england school |
| • | Unfortunately you don't say whether definitely a school is going to be in Larkhall. So I can only agree with this if a school is in Larkhall. However I do agree that it should be suitable for children up to 18, that is a sixth form college as well at St Mark's. |
| • | I would like to retain a Church of England school on St Mark's site. Our family chose the school specifically because of our faith. The C of E ethos is distinctive & appeals to those without a faith as well, who recognise the benefits that a Christian approach confers. I want to retain the choice to have a C of E secondary school in Bath, and St. Mark's is the best site for that. It has recently been judged 'Outstanding' in its SIAS inspection. |
| • | Only if the Anglicans want it |
| • | I support 2b and that the Larkhall School be a Church of England school proposed by the Anglican Diocese. |
| • | Absolutely. As a practising christian I think the city needs a church of England school. There are alot of pimary/junior CofE schools and if you remove St Marks school, then there will be no feeder school for them that continues with the christian ethos |
| • | i would like to retain a CofE school on st mark's site. my family chose the school specifically because of our faith. the CofE ethos is distinctive and appeals to those without a faith as well, who recognise the benefits that a christian approach confers. i want to retain the choice to have a CofE secondary school in bath, and st marks is the best site for that. it has recently been judged and 'outstanding' school in its SIAS inspection. |
| • | I would agree with this option |
| • | My preference because I live in Larkhall. ie self-interest. |
| • | St Mark's is very much a community school and the village of Larkhall would greatly miss having a school on the St Mark's site. Building the school on the St mark's site would help ensure that demand for church school places is met. |
| • | This is the ideal solution. St marks is a good school and outstanding faith school and part of the larkhall community. It is the only C of E school in Bath. The site is attractive and has huge potential for development. |
| • | And what about parents who are strongly in favour of secular schools???? It's outrageous to expect non-religious families to put up with a 'like it or lump it' local education decision. |
| • | This makes more sense to me - both St Marks and Culverhay, based on their results, are performing well and that could be addressed by replacing it with a new school and system. But Oldfield is successful and should not be closed down - its working well. |
| • | As with 2a, both schools should remain and be co-ed. Both are excellent schools serving their communities and delivering good quality, rounded education for children with the broadest ranges of needs. Closing Oldfield deprives that community of a local school. |
| • | This I feel is the best option as if St Marks closed there would be no school close enough to serve the community. I also support the idea of St marks getting together with St Gregory's and using it as a sixth form collage. |

| | |
|---|---|
| • | What is wrong with current St Marks build ? What would need to be done to existing buildings to admit 160 per year ? |
| • | 1.If a school is to be shut it makes much more sense to keep one on the Oldfield site. It has far more land than the St Marks site, including playing fields. In these times of childhood obesity and mental health problems for kids, for the Council to even be considering shutting a school with playing fields and quite deliberately opening one without playing fields is absolutely disgraceful. 2. We don't want a religious based education for our children. |
| • | I feel in the current social climate, religious schools do not serve to encourage children to be accepting of various cultural and social differences. After experiencing the narrow minded selection criteria for our most local primary school (St Mary's) I am disgusted that discrimination due to religious belief is allowed to continue within education. |
| • | In light of recent events we do not know if keeping a school on the Culverhay site and the St Mark's site is still an option. If only one site can be used for the new school, we support the St Mark's site. |
| • | If the council insisted on following this proposal I would have to support option b as St Marks is my family's local school. However, I feel incensed that the council has caused the 3 schools concerned to be battling each other for survival, particularly St Marks and Culverhay who offer so much to their children and communities. |
| • | This would be the most appropriate option, given that Oldfield takes most of its pupils from outside BANES |
| • | This is the preferred option. |
| • | Education and religion should not be compulsory! |
| • | With the choices given this would be the option I would prefer. |
| • | The choices seem to change daily, the current proposal for a 'hard' federation appears to have a lot going for it. The chance for St Marks to pool resources with St Gregory's, financial, pastoral and educational would, I feel, benefit both communities. The children would gain opportunities not currently available, new resources and curriculum areas could be pursued. The prospect for children from both schools to move seamlessly to a new sixth form facility also seems both logical and sensible |
| • | I disagree with this choice. |
| • | This would be preferred. |
| • | I would prefer this option as we live in Larkhall. I would see it as an opportunity to improve local secondary provision. I like the idea of a local Church of England secondary school. |
| • | St Mark's School has been the only school to have shown in this consultation a commitment to the children of its community. Whilst I disagree with the methods that the Headteacher has approached her position in this consultation, I do believe that St Mark's is a vital lifeline in the communities of Larkhall and Fairfield Park and that to lose a school in this area would be a devastating loss to the community. |
| • | This option would leave the Newbridge area and a large part of south west bath with no nearby secondary school. |
| • | We would prefer a new school on the current St mark's site. |
| • | This would be our strong preference. |
| • | I would support the provision of a Church of England secondary school |
| • | I would support a new CofE school at St Mark's if its admission criteria do not give preference to Church members. I am concerned that local children who are not |

| | |
|---|---|
| | church members may be denied a place if the school becomes oversubscribed. For example, non-churchgoing children who live less than half a mile from St Mark's can be in Category 8 under St Mark's current admissions criteria; this would be unacceptable if St Mark's becomes the only coed secondary school in the north of the city. |
| • | I would support this option as I feel a Church of England school would provide the option of a christian school and associated ethos which as a parent I feel should be an part of the overall provision and choice for families. |
| • | Since St. marks and St. Gregory's wish to hard federate this seems to be the best option as this will leave the north side of the city with a school serving its community and a south side one. |
| • | St Marks had been graded as 'Good' and as 'Outstanding' as a Church school. It has the support of the Church of England and is a very viable option. Why should the ST Mark's site only be considered if a new Church School is decided upon? This smacks of monetary considerations rather than educational ones. Suppose all want a church school, and the St Marks site is not big enough for the demand? Not very equal opportunity here. |
| • | I support having a Church of England school on the St Marks site. Larkhall is a very particular location: church, shops, businesses, housing, Transition, New Oriel Hall, Larkhall Festival. It is unique in having a vibrant and active community. We want a secondary presence but it must be a revitalised presence. We will work so that parents are confident that they become willing to send their children to the secondary school. |
| • | This option is preferable. My children can walk to the school whereas moving the school would require at least 200 children being required to commute in the city increasing traffic congestion. Public bus transport is NOT an option as it is too expensive and increases the risks my children would be required to face through daily commuting. The loss of children growing up and schooling in their home area and community due to a closure of St Marks is not acceptable. |
| • | I support the proposal 2b |
| • | This is a excellent idea keeps everyone happy as long as the schools can remain open while all maintenance is being done |
| • | I would be happy for a new school on the St Marks site to retain Church of England status. To me that's a real positive and incentive to send my children there. |
| • | This is the option that I favour strongly. This would best serve the needs of the community and would preserve the contribution of the church in secondary education. There all sorts of benefits of church involvement at this sort of level. It keeps the Christian voice in the mix at a time when there is a growing need for cultural, religious and historical sensitivities. |
| • | Keep a school on the current St Marks site |
| • | Please see above comment. |
| • | I would like to have a new coeducational school on the St. Marks site in Larkhall. |
| • | This would seem to be the best idea. I would like to keep a church school. The only other church school is St Gregorys and that is always full. |
| • | Parental choice should be a strong consideration and maintaining a Church of England faith school in the city should be a priority |
| • | This is my preferred option. |
| • | We support this option. The school is halfway between where BANES pupils live bringing them together. |

| | |
|---|--|
| • | If a new school is to be built we would prefer a C of E school to be built on the ST. Marks site. |
| • | If St Marks is the chosen site, and is a C of E school, then that leaves those looking to send their children to a co-educational, non religious school no option. Again not enough information on if the church will propose the school or not. |
| • | We would be concerned with our only close option being a faith school and may decide that single sex was preferable to faith, though it would mean sending our two children (boy and girl) to two different schools. |
| • | One of the schools needs to be CofE |
| • | Better |
| • | Yes support new CofE school |
| • | Yes but not keen on church aspect |
| • | Yes - St Marks |

A Review of Secondary Schools in Bath **A summary of on-time responses via E-Consult**

| | |
|--|------------|
| Parent responses | 353 |
| Pupil responses | 48 |
| Staff responses | 41 |
| Governor responses | 33 |
| Member of community near schools | 109 |
| Other: Grandparents; ex-pupils, parents of ex-pupils, residents outside of BANES | 35 |
| Total | 619 |

Note: Total replies are 421 on e-consult (619 including drafts which have been counted). Some responses may have ticked more than one box which accounts for the differences in totals.

Q1. Do you agree with the Council's overall plan/strategy for Bath?

| Total Replies | Yes | % | No | % |
|---------------|-----|----|-----|----|
| 418 | 302 | 72 | 116 | 28 |

| YES by Post Code | Yes | % |
|------------------|-----|----|
| BA1 | 168 | 55 |
| BA2 | 90 | 30 |
| BA3 and BA5 | 10 | 3 |
| BS* | 23 | 8 |
| SN* | 9 | 3 |
| Other | 2 | 1 |
| Total | 302 | |

| NO by Post Code | No | % |
|-----------------|-----|----|
| BA1 | 73 | 59 |
| BS | 14 | 11 |
| Other | 37 | 30 |
| Total | 124 | |

| NO Parent at | No | % |
|-------------------------|-----|------|
| Culverhay | 1 | .3 |
| Oldfield | 38 | 11 |
| St Mark's | 10 | 3 |
| Other including Primary | 60 | 17.5 |
| Total | 109 | 31.8 |

| YES Parent at | Yes | % |
|-------------------------|-----|------|
| Culverhay | 13 | 3.8 |
| Oldfield | 4 | 1.2 |
| St Mark's | 30 | 8.7 |
| Other including Primary | 187 | 54.5 |
| Total | 234 | 68.2 |

Parents ticking 'Other including Primary': majority from St Gregory's, Newbridge, St Saviours Infant and Juniors

| Member of Staff at | Yes | No |
|-------------------------|-----|----|
| Culverhay | 8 | |
| Oldfield | | 2 |
| St Mark's | 17 | 3 |
| Other including Primary | 15 | 4 |
| Total | 37 | 9 |

| Governor at | Yes | No |
|-------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Culverhay | 5 | |
| Oldfield | | |
| St Mark's | 2 | |
| Other including Primary | 26 | 4 |
| Total | 33 | 4 |

| Member of Community near | Yes | No |
|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Culverhay | 10 | 1 |
| Oldfield | 24 | 6 |
| St Mark's | 28 | 12 |
| Other including Primary | 22 | 12 |

Other 'yes': 30 made up primary age parents, grandparents, ex-pupils and people with an interest in education and in particular a church education.

Other 'no' to Q1: 7

Q2. Do you agree with the proposal to close Culverhay, Oldfield and St Mark's schools and to open one new 11-18 co-educational school with a planned admission number of 160 in the north of the City and a linked proposal to open one new 11-18 co-educational school with a planned admission number of 160 in the south of the City?

| Total Replies | Yes | % | No | % |
|----------------------|------------|----------|-----------|----------|
| 418 | 275 | 66 | 143 | 34 |

| YES by Post Code | Yes | % |
|-------------------------|------------|----------|
| BA1 | 148 | 51 |
| BA2 | 89 | 31 |
| BS30 | 6 | 2 |
| BS31 | 3 | 1 |
| SN* | 9 | 3 |
| Other | 35 | 12 |
| Total | 290 | |

| NO by Post Code | No | % |
|------------------------|-----------|----------|
| BA1 | 93 | 62 |
| BA2 | 15 | 10 |
| BS15 | 11 | 7 |
| BS30 | 8 | 5 |
| Other | 24 | 16 |
| Total | 151 | |

| YES Parent at | Yes | % |
|-------------------------|------------|----------|
| Culverhay | 13 | 3.8 |
| Oldfield | 2 | .6 |
| St Mark's | 27 | 7.9 |
| Other including Primary | 172 | 50.1 |
| Total | 214 | 62.4 |

| No Parent at | No | % |
|-------------------------|-----------|----------|
| Culverhay | 1 | .3 |
| Oldfield | 40 | 11.7 |
| St Mark's | 13 | 3.8 |
| Other including Primary | 75 | 21.9 |
| Total | 129 | 37.6 |

Parents ticking 'Other including Primary': majority from St Gregory's, Newbridge, St Saviours Infant and Juniors, Newbridge and WASPS

| Member of Staff at | Yes | No |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Culverhay | 8 | |
| Oldfield | | 2 |
| St Mark's | 12 | 6 |
| Other including Primary | 10 | 13 |
| Total | 30 | 21 |

| Governor at | Yes | No |
|-------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Culverhay | 5 | |
| Oldfield | | |
| St Mark's | 1 | |
| Other including Primary | 30 | 8 |
| Total | 36 | 8 |

| Member of Community near | Yes | No |
|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Culverhay | 9 | 2 |
| Oldfield | 19 | 10 |
| St Mark's | 24 | 6 |
| Other including Primary | 17 | 28 |
| Total | 69 | 28 |

Other 'yes': 27 made up primary age parents, grandparents, ex-pupils and people with an interest in education and in particular a church education.

Other 'no' to Q1: 7

Main issues from consultation responses

Most frequently occurring comments first

- Location of school – requirement north of river
- Preference for church school
- Requirement for more co-ed places
- Supporting six form at St Gregory's
- Closure of outstanding school
- Transport – across city to and from schools
- Loss of single sex school
- Question need for a church school
- Not educating Bristol families
- Uncertainty for staff and pupils
- No requirement for co-ed
- Lack of choice for parents
- SEN provision
- Increased planned housing

A Review of Secondary Schools in Bath Public Meetings

St Mark's 12th May

280 attended at St Mark's in the main hall, around 10 people were turned away and handed leaflets informing them of the Guildhall meeting. Approximately 75% of people who attended were local residents; 80% had a direct connection i.e. staff/governors/parents; 20% future parents – note some people put their hands up more than once.

Oldfield 19th May

76 attended at Oldfield in the main hall. Approximately 8 parents; 30 prospective parents and 15 interested parties.

Culverhay 20th May

58 attended at Culverhay in the main hall. Approximately 15 parents; 20 teachers; 4 parents from other schools; 5 governors and 10 in a professional capacity.

Guildhall

93 attended at the Guildhall. Approximately 60% had attended a previous meeting in Bath; 5 Oldfield parents; 10 St Mark's parents; 1 Culverhay governor and 2 St Mark's governors. Approximately 70% were parents of primary aged children. Two governors from Broadlands also attended along with various union representatives.

(Notes of the meetings have been taken and are available.)

| Bath & North East Somerset Council | | |
|---|---|---|
| MEETING: | Cabinet | |
| MEETING DATE: | 21 July 2010 | AGENDA ITEM NUMBER 13 |
| TITLE: | A Review of Secondary Schools in Keynsham | EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE: E 2153 |
| WARD: | Farmborough, Saltford, Keynsham East, Keynsham South, Keynsham North, Publow & Whitchurch | |
| AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM | | |
| List of attachments to this report: Appendix 1 – Summary of consultation responses | | |

1. THE ISSUE

- 1.1. In March 2008 full Council approved a strategy for the future of secondary schools in Bath & North East Somerset. In May 2008 Cabinet agreed to consult on proposed changes to Keynsham schools, specifically the closure of Broadlands Community School and the expansion of Wellsway Community School to create a single secondary school for Keynsham.
- 1.2. A public consultation exercise on this proposal was undertaken between March and May 2010 and this report sets out the results of the consultation.

2. RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet is asked to:

- 2.1. Note the results of consultation on proposed changes to Keynsham secondary schools.
- 2.2. Agree that there are no changes to Keynsham secondary schools and to inform the governing bodies of Broadlands and Wellsway schools that the Council has no plans to undertake further reviews in the foreseeable future.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1. The impact of any decision will depend on the specific details of the decision and the resultant number of pupils attending Bath & North East Somerset schools.
- 3.2. Revenue funds are provided to the LA based on the number of pupils attending schools within the LA. The allocation known as the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is a ring-fenced grant that has to be spent on schools or services supporting schools under regulations laid down in the Education Act 2003.
- 3.3. The current DSG allocation per pupil (2010-11) is £4,203 per pupil. Funding allocations to schools average approximately £3,850 leaving £350 per pupil used on services supporting schools.
- 3.4. The principles of school funding are that if a school is closed then funding would follow the pupils to whichever school they attend. So if the pupil numbers attending Bath & North East Somerset schools were to reduce then there would be a subsequent reduction in DSG.
- 3.5. If Broadlands school were to be closed and Wellsway school expanded then it is anticipated there would be a reduction in pupils attending Bath & North East Somerset schools. It is anticipated that pupil numbers attending Bath & North East Somerset schools would decrease as set out in the table below.
- 3.6. The schedule below sets out the possible impact of the pupil reductions on the gross DSG income

| Year | Broadlands and Wellsway Estimated Pupil numbers | Difference From current | DSG Budget reductions £000s | Cumulative reductions £000s |
|------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Jan 2009 | 2065 | | | |
| 2010-11 | 1944 | 121 | 42 | |
| 2011-12 | 1831 | 113 | 40 | 82 |
| 2012-13 | 1677 | 154 | 54 | 136 |
| 2013-14 | 1531 | 146 | 51 | 187 |
| 2014-15 | 1434 | 97 | 34 | 221 |
| 2015-16 | 1390 | 44 | 15 | 236 |
| 2016-17 | 1350 | 40 | 14 | 250 |
| Cumulative | | 715 | 250 | |

- 3.7. This reduction in pupils would result in a reduction in resources available to support schools and pupils of approximately £250,000 if the school closed completely. The transition period would result in a staged reduction in resources.
- 3.8 If Broadlands were not closed it is possible that the pupil numbers might expand or contract as parental choice will impact on pupil numbers.
- 3.9 There would be ongoing capital maintenance costs of keeping two schools open, which would limit any possible improvements at schools as resources are restricted in coming years.
- 3.10 The capital resource implications are linked to the site sale of Broadlands should the school be closed. Any receipt from the sale of the site would under current council policy be ring-fenced for investment in the school estate. It is estimated that the Broadlands site could release approximately £6m-£8m. However a conservative approach to any building projects funded from this resource would be followed.
- 3.11 Building projects at Wellsway would be necessary to ensure that the pupils displaced from Broadlands could be accommodated on the Wellsway site. It would be necessary to carry out these projects prior to the sale of the Broadlands site, and the project planning will accommodate the anticipated borrowing requirement that would be required.

4. CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- *Improving life chances of disadvantaged teenagers and young people*
- *Improving school buildings*
- *Sustainable growth*
- *Addressing the causes and effects of Climate Change*

5. THE REPORT

Background

- 5.1. In Jan 2007 the Children and Young People Overview & Scrutiny Panel completed a review of all our secondary schools. The Panel visited each school to see the facilities available to young people and staff in each school. They also held open public contributor sessions where the views of head teachers, governors, local councillors and the local community were heard.
- 5.2. The purpose of the review was *'to ensure that the current high standards in our secondary schools are maintained and improved; that all our resources are used effectively; that wherever possible, good facilities are available to all users of school buildings; that the natural choice of parents and pupils will be their local school; that travel to schools by private car should be reduced where possible'*.
- 5.3. Following consideration of the findings of the Panel, full Council and Cabinet in 2008 agreed a strategy for secondary schools in Bath & North East Somerset and officers were authorised to consult on changes to secondary schools in Keynsham: specifically the closure of Broadlands Community School and the expansion of Wellsway Community School to create a single secondary school for Keynsham. Officers were also asked if possible to gain early access to Building Schools for the Future (BSF) funding to enable major capital investment to renew and remodel secondary schools in line with any proposed changes.

- 5.4. In 2009 it became apparent that Bath & North East Somerset was unlikely to gain early access to BSF funding due to the economic downturn leading to uncertainty about the future of the programme. However, as capital investment is possible from sale of surplus school sites if it was agreed that schools should close, it was decided to proceed with a public consultation.
- 5.5. The public consultation was launched on 28 March and ran for two months. Approximately 5300 copies of a consultation document setting out the issues and key challenges in Keynsham were distributed to parents at Broadlands, Wellsway and all Keynsham primary schools. Copies were also sent to neighbouring local authorities and other stakeholders such as the Catholic and Anglican dioceses, Keynsham Town Council, parish councils and community groups and organisations using Broadlands and Wellsway schools. A copy of the consultation document can be found on the Council website (http://consultations.bathnes.gov.uk/consult.ti/keynsham_review/consultationHome). People were invited to respond using the detachable pro forma in the document, by email and letter or on line through the Council website.
- 5.6. Public consultation meetings were held at both schools with an additional meeting at St Keyna Primary School. Every attempt was made to ensure that the meetings could accommodate those wishing to attend including the provision of overflow areas with both an audio and visual link so that people could see and hear the presentations by officers and the schools. The meetings were well attended; in particular the Broadlands meeting where unfortunately despite the overflow area some people had to be turned away as capacity could not be breached due to fire regulations. These people were directed to the St Keyna meeting a few days later. A summary record of the public meetings has been provided to Cabinet and made available at public libraries. In total 683 people attended the public meetings.

Key challenges in Keynsham

- 5.7. As set out in the consultation document, although standards at Broadlands and Wellsway are good overall there are a number of challenges in Keynsham and the proposal for a single school in Keynsham seeks to address these. In summary the challenges are:
- 5.8. Together these two schools have a total of 2,135 (January 2009) places available for pupils aged 11-16. However, only about 1,100 pupils aged 11-16 attending the schools are from Bath & North East Somerset. Approximately 1,000 pupils aged 11-16 attend Broadlands and Wellsway schools from Bristol and South Gloucestershire, the majority of these at Broadlands.
- 5.9. Where pupils live in areas some distance away from their school community it can make it difficult for young people to access support and after school extended services.
- 5.10. The majority of Broadlands school pupils return to Bristol schools and colleges at age 16 resulting in a very small sixth form at Broadlands school. A single school in Keynsham with an appropriately sized sixth form would be able to better meet the needs of all pupils.
- 5.11. Pupils from Bristol and South Gloucestershire may not continue to attend Keynsham schools in the future leading to surplus places.

5.12. Both Wellsway and Broadlands schools have some buildings which are in poor condition and need improvement. Maintaining a smaller number of schools and places will mean that resources for repairs and maintenance can be used as efficiently as possible.

5.13. Even with increased numbers of pupils from new housing, projections show that a single school in Keynsham would meet current and future pupil numbers.

Key issues arising from consultation

5.14. In total 5259 copies of the consultation document were issued with 1114 (20%) responses received. Appendix 1 provides analysis of the responses to the consultation questions and the relationship of respondents to the schools. This shows that an overwhelming majority of respondents (92%) are opposed to the closure of Broadlands and the expansion of Wellsway as the single school for Keynsham. There are 2325 pupils on roll at the schools and in total 236 responses were received from parents of pupils at Broadlands and Wellsway split almost equally between the schools. The views of parents at both schools who did respond were similar with 97% of Broadlands parents and 83% of Wellsway parents who responded opposed to the proposal. Responses from parents of pupils at primary and other schools were at a similar low relatively low level (112 in total) but again show a significant majority (76%) oppose the proposal.

5.15. Despite the large number of pupils from outside the Keynsham area attending Broadlands, analysis of respondents post codes show that the majority of those opposing the proposal (57%) are Keynsham residents.

5.16. Parents, pupils and staff associated with Broadlands argue that Broadlands is a good school with good standards which are continuing to improve, and that closure cannot be justified on educational grounds.

5.17. A number of parents from both within and outside Keynsham choosing Broadlands argue that they have made a positive decision to send their children to Broadlands school and that the closure of the school would remove this choice.

5.18. The consultation revealed that the size of the school is also an issue, with concern that the proposed expansion of Wellsway to a planned admission number of 270 (1350 11-16 pupils) is too large and that some pupils would not thrive in this environment.

5.19. A possible increase in traffic congestion if Wellsway was expanded was raised by a number of people concerned that there is already considerable traffic congestion in Chandag Road at the start and end of the school day.

5.20. Concern has also been expressed that the uncertainty over the future of Broadlands over the last two years has had a negative effect on staff and pupils. It is argued that closure would mean additional disruption to the education of a whole cohort of pupils, particularly those taking GCSEs during the period of closure and transition from two schools to a single school, possibly impacting on standards.

5.21. A small but significant number of respondents, including young people themselves expressed concern that Broadlands' specialism in Engineering would be lost if the school closed.

5.22. A number of respondents highlighted that without the Building Schools for the Future funding the reduced scope for capital investment in Wellsway would mean that only a limited amount of new building would be possible and that this is not in line with the agreed previously strategy which was to rebuild Wellsway to provide a single 'new school' for Keynsham.

5.23. The issue of the impact on Broadlands staff was also raised with understandable concerns about loss of jobs if there were to be a single school, including management posts where for example only one head of mathematics would be required.

5.24. The future of the Broadlands special resource base for pupils with a visual impairment was also a cause for concern for some respondents. The unit would however transfer to Wellsway school if Broadlands were to close (see section 7.2).

Key factors to consider

5.25. There are a number of key factors for Members to consider when deciding whether to proceed with changes to secondary schools in Keynsham.

a) The extent to which proposed changes can contribute to improving educational standards

5.26. As previously stated, standards at Wellsway are good and Broadlands are satisfactory. Wellsway has higher standards of attainment achieving 75% 5 or more GCSEs or equivalent including English and Maths in 2009, compared to 46% for Broadlands. Measurement of progress made by pupils based on comparing their end of primary school tests (aged 11) with their achievement GCSE (aged 16), known as Value Added, are broadly similar in both Wellsway and Broadlands schools.

5.27. A number of parents expressed the view that a school with a planned admission number of 270 (1350 11-16 pupils) is too big and a school of this size may not suit all pupils with a negative impact on their learning. There was also a concern that those with special educational needs (SEN) may not get the support they need and be affected disproportionately by being in a larger school. Whilst these concerns are understandable there are many examples of schools, some in neighbouring authorities, with a planned admission number of 270 which are rated as outstanding in all categories by Ofsted, including for SEN. There is no reason to think that an expanded Wellsway would not provide a very good education to a larger number of pupils including those with SEN.

5.28. Standards at Broadlands have improved in each of the last three years. Despite this progress the school feel strongly that the threat of closure since 2008 has had a negative impact on staff and pupils and the removal of this threat would enable the school to continue this progress and further improve standards. Should a decision be taken to close Broadlands and expand Wellsway it is possible that the disruption could lead to a drop in standards at both schools during the transition period.

5.29. Members will need to weigh the potential for a larger single school to achieve higher standards for all pupils from Keynsham and Saltford, offering more opportunities for curriculum development especially at Post 16, against the possible negative impact on standards that the disruption caused by transition and

building works may have, particularly when there has been an overwhelmingly negative response from both school communities to the proposal.

b) The extent to which the schools are meeting local need

5.30. Members will need to weigh the potential for a larger single school to achieve higher standards for all pupils from Keynsham and Saltford, offering more opportunities for curriculum development especially at Post 16, against the possible negative impact on standards that the disruption caused by transition and building works may have, particularly when there has been an overwhelmingly negative response from both school communities to the proposal.

5.31. Admission figures for 2009 show that the large majority of pupils attending Broadlands do not come from Keynsham. Approximately 71% of Year 7 (Age 11) entering the school in 2009 were from outside Bath & North East Somerset (mostly from Bristol) and that approximately 28% were from within the Broadlands 'catchment' area. Further analysis shows that in 2009 approximately 35% of pupils resident within the Broadlands 'catchment' area entered Broadlands with 44% entering Wellsway. The remaining 21% made other choices.

5.32. Of the total number of first preferences expressed by parents of Bath & North East Somerset resident pupils for a place at Broadlands and Wellsway in 2010 approximately 18% were for Broadlands and 82% were for Wellsway.

5.33. As the majority of Keynsham parents choose Wellsway it cannot be argued that Broadlands school primarily serves its local community in terms of meeting the educational needs of Bath & North East Somerset children. However, there can be no doubt that parents and pupils from both Keynsham and Bristol choosing Broadlands have made a positive decision to attend the school and value the choice that two schools provides. A number of parents from the Bristol area made the point that they made efforts to ensure their children play a full part in community activities in Keynsham enabling them to socialise with friends living in Keynsham and attending school and community events with benefits to the local economy. It must also be recognised that outside school hours Broadlands does serve the local community by providing facilities for a range of activities.

c) Whether proposals will lead to a more efficient and effective use of resources

5.34. When considering the efficient and effective use of resources it is necessary to consider both revenue and capital funding.

5.35. Revenue - As set out in Section 3 above, a reduction in pupils attending Broadlands from outside Bath & North East Somerset will have an impact on both the revenue budgets for schools as a whole and the Children's Service budget. Closure of Broadlands would result in a reduction of £250,000 in revenue funding available for services managed by the LA for all schools such as the Behaviour Support Service although this impact would be felt over a five year period as pupils from outside Bath & North East Somerset schools currently at Broadlands and Wellsway would continue at the schools until completing their education at the end of Year 11 or 13. Allocations to schools for fixed cost element of their funding e.g. Headteacher, caretaking and office facilities (photocopier and licences etc) would be reduced therefore releasing resources for priorities in all other schools. The savings from these fixed cost elements of the school funding formula are approximately £150,000.

- 5.36. The savings from running fewer schools would be ring-fenced to the Direct Schools Grant (DSG) and the Schools Forum would decide on the use of any savings. With previous reviews (primary schools) the forum has agreed to utilise the savings from school closures to support the redundancy costs associated with any closures and then to utilise the savings to support prudential borrowing to raise additional capital to invest in school buildings. Given the likely future pressure on school budgets in future years it is possible that the Forum may not feel able to support the continuation of this practice.
- 5.37. Capital - The Government has recently announced it is halting the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme which removes prospects of building new schools in Bath & North East Somerset. Future levels of other capital funding from government are also almost certain to be significantly less than previous years. Children's Services in line with all Council departments will also face revenue budget reductions impacting on the capacity to borrow to fund capital. In these circumstances the already considerable backlog of schools planned maintenance e.g. roofs, windows, and boilers is likely to increase with only highest priority essential work being done. This will mean that necessary but less essential maintenance will not be possible with consequent deterioration in those areas of the buildings with a risk that some parts of buildings become unfit for purpose. Retaining two schools will in time increase the overall level of essential maintenance required at a time when funding is reducing.
- 5.38. If it were decided to close Broadlands school, building work would be necessary at Wellsway to increase capacity before Broadlands could close. It would be necessary to fund borrowing to finance these works before the Broadlands site is sold. What borrowing that would be required would be built into the department's medium term financial plan. To reduce the risk of works costing more than the eventual release of funding from the sale of a site valued at £6-8m, only essential works required to provide the additional accommodation at Wellsway would be funded initially to a maximum of two thirds of the predicted level of the receipt. It would also be necessary to undertake adaptations to make Wellsway more accessible for disabled people as Broadlands is the designated accessible school for Keynsham and has high level of accessibility including a resource base for visually impaired pupils. Traditionally this would have been funded from Department for Education Schools Access Initiative funding. However it is not certain this funding stream will survive the reduction in government capital allocations to local authorities and therefore these works would be a call on the capital receipt, although they could be phased over a number of years.
- 5.39. The likely level of investment possible from the expected capital receipt is sufficient to provide accommodation to meet increased pupil numbers but may not be sufficient to make a significant difference to the quality of accommodation at Wellsway and will not provide the 'new' school for Keynsham that was previously envisaged to be delivered through Building Schools for the Future.
- 5.40. Members will need to consider the negative impact on revenue funding of reduced pupil numbers attending school in Keynsham as set out in Section 3, against reduced capital expenditure in the long term through a reduction in planned maintenance if Broadlands school were to be closed.

d) Will a single school for Keynsham be sufficient to cope with increased pupils numbers including projected housing developments in the medium to long term

5.41. As set out in the consultation document in response to the need for new housing, the Council is considering options that mean planning for and delivering 1,350 to 1,600 new dwellings for Keynsham by 2026. Based on previous developments this might generate approximately 200 to 250 pupils aged 11-16 by 2026, which is roughly an extra 40 to 50 children in each year group. Approximately 10-20 pupils each year from the Whitchurch area attend Broadlands school. If the Whitchurch area was re-designated as an area for pupils to attend Chew Valley school rather than Broadlands school, then the remaining pupils from the Broadlands school "catchment area" could be catered for at an expanded Wellsway with a Planned Admission Number of 270.

5.42. Long term pupil place planning is necessarily speculative as it is based on current known proposed levels of housing development. The implications of the recent announcement by the Government that they will abolish Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) and transfer control to councils are currently being considered. However, it is unlikely that additional housing over and above that set out in the options above will be directed towards Keynsham. The decision to retain the two schools in Keynsham as at present means that the pupils generated from this planned new housing can be accommodated in both schools in the future, particularly at Broadlands.

e) The level of public support for the proposal

5.43. The overwhelming majority of those people responding to the consultation are opposed to the proposal to close Broadlands school and expand Wellsway school. This has been evident at both the public meetings and through the written responses received, with 92% opposing the proposal. Opposition is not only from those outside Bath & North East Somerset but also within Keynsham and from those associated with both schools. It could be argued that a relatively small number of parents from Broadlands and Wellsway responded to the consultation - 236 from a pupil population of approximately 2300, nevertheless it is clear there is overwhelming opposition to the proposal.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

6.1. The report author and Lead Cabinet member have fully reviewed the risk assessment related to the issue and recommendations, in compliance with the Council's decision making risk management guidance.

7. EQUALITIES

7.1. An equalities impact assessment has been carried out and reviewed by the Lead Cabinet Member.

7.2. If the decision were to be taken to close Broadlands school then it would be necessary to ensure that the resource base for Visually Impaired pupils is provided at Wellsway. Currently there are five young people at the unit. In addition as Broadlands is the designated the accessible school for Keynsham it has a high level of accessibility for disabled people. It would be necessary to undertake adaptations at Wellsway to ensure a similar level of accessibility. These works would be a call on the capital available from the sale of Broadlands site or could be funded from DfE Schools Access Initiative funding if this funding continues.

8. RATIONALE

8.1. The strategy for secondary schools agreed by Council states that the future structure of secondary provision in Bath & North East Somerset should reflect the

numbers of children from within the Authority. The high number of pupils coming into Keynsham, chiefly from Bristol, distorts the real level of need. The strategy also states that the local school should be the natural choice for parents. In Keynsham the majority of parents in both the Wellsway and Broadlands 'catchment' areas, choose Wellsway as their local school. Wellsway which is centrally located in the Keynsham and Saltford area occupies a large site with scope for expansion. On this basis there is a supportable case for a single school for Keynsham on the Wellsway site.

- 8.2. The principles behind the proposal and on which consultation was undertaken remain sound. A single school for Keynsham could meet local need within Bath & North East Somerset and has the potential to deliver improved educational standards through increased curriculum opportunities and a larger post-16 provision. A single school for all Keynsham and Saltford children would also improve social cohesion. There are also financial benefits through the generation of a capital receipt to invest in Wellsway to improve facilities and a reduction in planned maintenance through the closure of poor condition buildings.
- 8.3. Set against these potential benefits there are potential educational and financial risks associated with the proposal. The potential for improved educational standards could be affected by the disruption to pupils and staff at both schools caused by the transition from two schools to one. Although staff and governors at both schools would try to ensure standards were maintained this may be more difficult to achieve when the consultation has clearly established that both school communities are strongly opposed to the proposal.
- 8.4. The cancellation of the Building Schools for the Future programme means that the aspiration of building a 'new' expanded Wellsway school serving the whole of Keynsham will not be achieved, although some improvements to buildings could be made. The abandonment of the Regional Spatial Strategy makes it unlikely significant extra housing will be directed towards Keynsham. enabling pupils generated from planned new housing to be accommodated in both schools in the future, particularly at Broadlands..
- 8.5. Whilst there are financial benefits through a reduction in planned maintenance and the generation of a capital receipt, there will be a significant loss of revenue through a reduction in overall pupil numbers impacting on both the overall schools and Children's Services budgets. Perhaps most importantly the public consultation has shown that people are overwhelmingly opposed to the proposal and that this view has been expressed by parents of pupils at both schools and also parents of pupils at Keynsham primary schools.
- 8.6. Whenever changes to schools are proposed some people will oppose these and Members must weigh this against the potential advantages of the changes. On balance it is felt that given the level of opposition to the proposals for Keynsham and the risks associated with it as set out above, there should be no change to the organisation of Keynsham secondary schools.

9. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 9.1. The option of closing both schools and opening a new school serving Keynsham and Saltford on the Frys site has been suggested by some respondents. The closure of both Keynsham secondary schools could not be justified as Wellsway is a popular school with high standards serving pupils within Bath & North East

Somerset. The Frys site does not provide a realistic option for a new school as it is not owned by the Council and is not centrally located for Keynsham and Saltford. The land required for a secondary school which would be a significant proportion of the Frys site earmarked for development and would have to be purchased. Even with the disposal of both present school sites there would be insufficient funding to buy the land needed on the Frys site and then build a new school likely to cost in the region of £25m.

10. CONSULTATION

10.1. *Ward Councillor; Cabinet members; Parish Council; Town Council; Trades Unions; Overview & Scrutiny Panel; Staff; Other B&NES Services; Service Users; Local Residents; Community Interest Groups; Youth Council; Stakeholders/Partners; Other Public Sector Bodies; Section 151 Finance Officer; Chief Executive; Monitoring Officer.*

10.2. Extensive and wide reaching consultation on the school re-organisation proposals for Keynsham were undertaken between March and May 2010. This included a consultation document circulated to a range of statutory consultees to include pupils, parents and carers, school staff - both teaching and non-teaching, ward councillors, local MPs, Catholic and Anglican dioceses, trade unions and neighbouring authorities. Local public consultation meetings were held at each school with an additional meeting organised for those unable to attend the school meetings.

11. ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN REACHING THE DECISION

11.1. *Social Inclusion; Sustainability; Human Resources; Property; Young People; Corporate; Impact on Staff; Other Legal Considerations*

12. ADVICE SOUGHT

12.1. The Council's Monitoring Officer (Council Solicitor) and Section 151 Officer (Divisional Director - Finance) have had the opportunity to input to this report and have cleared it for publication.

| | |
|--|---|
| Contact person | Chris Kavanagh 01225 395149 |
| Sponsoring Cabinet Member | Councillor Chris Watt |
| Background papers | Consultation document – ‘A Review of Secondary Schools in Keynsham’ |
| Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format | |

This page is intentionally left blank

A Review of Secondary Schools in Keynsham

Appendix

A Review of Secondary Schools in Keynsham

Questionnaire Summary Results

1

Do you agree with the proposal to have a single 11-18 co-educational school in Keynsham?

| Option | Count |
|---------------|--------------|
| Yes | 8% (81) |
| No | 92% (995) |

2

Do you agree that the single school in Keynsham should be Wellsway with a PAN of 270 serving the current Wellsway APR and Broadlands APR excluding the Whitchurch area and that Broadlands should close?

| Option | Count |
|---------------|--------------|
| Yes | 8% (82) |
| No | 92% (994) |

a

Parent/carer involved with:

| Option | Count |
|--|--------------|
| Broadlands | 34% (119) |
| Wellsway | 34% (117) |
| Other school (including Primary and Special) | 32% (112) |

b

Pupil at:

| Option | Count |
|--|--------------|
| Broadlands | 89% (324) |
| Wellsway | 4% (16) |
| Other school (including Primary and Special) | 7% (24) |

c

Member of staff at:

This question has been answered 69 times.

d

Governor at:

This question has been answered 21 times.

e

Member of the community near:

This question has been answered 337 times.

f

Other (please specify and state school(s) name):

This question has been answered 132 times.

Name

This question has been answered 1076 times.

Postcode

This question has been answered 1076 times.

A Review of Secondary Schools in Keynsham A summary of on-time responses via E-Consult

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Parent responses | 348 |
| Pupil responses | 364 |
| Staff responses | 69 |
| Governor responses | 21 |
| Member of community near schools | 337 |
| Other: Grandparents; ex-pupils, parents of ex-pupils, residents outside of BANES | 132 |
| Total | 1,271 |

Note: Total replies are 1076 on e-consult (1114 including drafts which have been counted). Some responses may have ticked more than one box which accounts for the differences in total

Q1. Do you agree with the proposal to have a single 11-18 co-educational school in Keynsham.

| Total Replies | Yes | % | No | % |
|-----------------|-----|---|------|----|
| 1076 | 81 | 8 | 995 | 92 |
| 1114 inc drafts | 86 | | 1028 | |

| NO by Post Code | No | % |
|-----------------|------|----|
| BS4 | 131 | 13 |
| BS14 | 229 | 22 |
| BS30 | 13 | 1 |
| BS31 | 586 | 57 |
| BA* | 17 | 2 |
| Other BS* | 50 | 5 |
| Total | 1028 | |

| YES by Post Code | Yes | % |
|------------------|-----|----|
| BS4 | 2 | 2 |
| BS14 | 5 | 6 |
| BS30 | | |
| BS31 | 73 | 85 |
| BA* | 2 | 2 |
| Other BS* | 4 | 5 |
| Total | 82 | |

| NO Parent at | No | % |
|-------------------------|-----|----|
| Broadlands | 116 | 33 |
| Wellsway | 101 | 29 |
| Other including Primary | 85 | 24 |
| Total | 302 | 86 |

| YES Parent at | Yes | % |
|-------------------------|-----|------|
| Broadlands | 3 | 0.9 |
| Wellsway | 16 | 4.6 |
| Other including Primary | 27 | 8 |
| Total | 46 | 13.2 |

| NO Member of Staff at | No | % |
|-------------------------|----|----|
| Broadlands | 54 | 75 |
| Wellsway | 7 | 10 |
| Other including Primary | 11 | 15 |
| Total | 72 | |

Members of Staff answering 'yes' to Q1: 1 at Broadlands, 1 at Wellsway and 2 from other local schools.

| NO Governor at | No |
|-------------------------|-----------|
| Broadlands | 5 |
| Wellsway | 0 |
| Other including Primary | 15 |
| Total | 20 |

Governors answering 'yes' to Q1: 0 at Broadlands, 2 at Wellsway and 2 from other local schools.

| NO Member of Community | No |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| Broadlands | 70 |
| Wellsway | 151 |
| Not including Broadlands or Wellsway | 100 |
| Total | 321 |

Members of the community answering 'yes' to Q1: 15 near Broadlands; 14 near Wellsway and 6 from other i.e. Keynsham.

Other answering 'no' to Q1: 128 made up of Grandparents, ex-pupils, Keynsham residents, parents of ex-pupils and Bristol residents

Other answering 'yes' to Q1: 5

Q2. Do you agree that the single school in Keynsham should be Wellsway and with a PAN of 270 serving the current Wellsway APR and Broadlands APR excluding the Whitchurch area and that Broadlands should close?

| Total Replies | Yes | % | No | % |
|------------------------|------------|----------|-------------|----------|
| 1076 | 82 | 8 | 994 | 92 |
| <i>1114 inc drafts</i> | <i>86</i> | | <i>1028</i> | |

| NO by Post Code | No | % |
|------------------------|-----------|----------|
| BS4 | 131 | 13 |
| BS14 | 231 | 23 |
| BS30 | 15 | 1 |
| BS31 | 582 | 57 |
| BA* | 11 | 1 |
| Other BS* | 56 | 5 |
| Total | 1026 | |

| YES by Post Code | YES | % |
|-------------------------|------------|----------|
| BS4 | 2 | 2 |
| BS14 | 3 | 3 |
| BS30 | | |
| BS31 | 77 | 91 |
| BA* | 3 | 39 |
| Other | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 86 | |

| NO Parent at | No | % |
|-------------------------|-----------|----------|
| Broadlands | 116 | 33.3 |
| Wellsway | 97 | 27.9 |
| Other including Primary | 87 | 25 |
| Total | 300 | 86.2 |

| YES Parent at | Yes | % |
|-------------------------|------------|----------|
| Broadlands | 3 | 0.9 |
| Wellsway | 20 | 5.7 |
| Other including Primary | 25 | 7.2 |
| Total | 48 | 13.8 |

| NO Member of Staff at | No | % |
|------------------------------|-----------|----------|
| Broadlands | 54 | 77 |
| Wellsway | 6 | 8 |
| Other including Primary | 11 | 15 |
| Total | 71 | |

Members of Staff answering 'yes' to Q2: 1 at Broadlands, 2 at Wellsway and 1 from other.

| NO Governor at | No |
|-------------------------|-----------|
| Broadlands | 5 |
| Wellsway | |
| Other including Primary | 12 |
| Total | 17 |

Governors answering 'yes' to Q2: 0 at Broadlands, 2 at Wellsway and 2 from other schools.

| NO Member of Community | No |
|---|-----------|
| Broadlands | 75 |
| Wellsway | 150 |
| Not including Broadlands or Wellsway (i.e. Keynsham and Saltford) | 101 |
| Total | 326 |

Members of the community answering 'yes' to Q2: 10 near Broadlands; 15 near Wellsway and 6 from other i.e. Keynsham and Saltford.

Other answering 'no' to Q2: 129 made up of Grandparents, ex-pupils, Keynsham residents, parents of ex-pupils and Bristol residents

Other answering 'yes' to Q2: 4

Main issues from consultation responses

Most frequently occurring comments first

- School too big/too many pupils
- Travel to School/Traffic Congestion/Pollution
- Housing developments and increased pupil numbers
- Effect on Broadlands Pupils/Teachers
- Lack of parental choice
- Keep 2 schools open
- Good school should not be closed
- Drop in Standards
- Differences/Specialisms
- Problems with teaching/management
- Should not be schooling Bristol pupils
- Disruption
- Rivalry/Fights
- Concern about Keynsham economy/community links
- Broadlands pupil concern about where they will be educated
- New school to be built on new site
- SEN provision
- Concern with new buildings provision at Wellsway
- Discipline
- School Uniform

A Review of Secondary Schools in Keynsham Public Meetings

Wellsway 11th May

160 attended at Wellsway in the main hall. Approximately 85% of people who attended were Broadlands staff/governors/parents and pupils; 10% Wellsway staff/governors and parents and around 5% were local residents/interested parties.

Broadlands 18th May

335 attended at Broadlands in the main hall plus 80 in overspill facility. 78 people were turned away. Approximately 80% of people who attended were Broadlands staff/governors/parents and pupils; 5% Wellsway staff/governors and parents and around 15% were local residents/interested parties.

St Keyna 26th May

108 attended at St Keyna in the main hall. Approximately 45% had attended a previous meeting in Keynsham; 27 who attended were Broadlands staff/governors/parents and pupils; 6 Wellsway staff/governors and parents and around 10 were local residents/interested parties from Keynsham.

(Notes of the meetings have been taken and are available.)

This page is intentionally left blank

| Bath & North East Somerset Council | | |
|---|---|--|
| MEETING: | Cabinet | |
| MEETING DATE: | 14th July 2010 | EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE: E 2124 |
| TITLE: | Treasury Management Outturn Report 2009/10 | |
| WARD: | All | |
| AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM | | |
| <p>List of attachments to this report:</p> <p>Appendix 1 – Performance Against Prudential Indicators Appendix 2 - The Council’s Investment Position at 31st March 2010 Appendix 3 – Average monthly rate of return for 2009/2010 Appendix 4 – The Council’s External Borrowing Position at 31st March 2010 Appendix 5 – Sterling Consultant’s Economic & Market Review of 2009/10 Appendix 6 – Interest & Capital Financing Budget Monitoring 2009/10</p> | | |

1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 In February 2010 the Council adopted the 2009 edition of the CIPFA Treasury Management in the Public Services: Code of Practice, which requires the Council to approve a Treasury Management Strategy before the start of each financial year, a mid year report, and an annual report after the end of each financial year.
- 1.2 This report gives details of performance against the Council's Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Plan for 2009/10.

2 RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet agrees that:

- 2.1 the 2009/10 Treasury Management Annual Report to 31st March 2010, prepared in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Code of Practice, is noted
- 2.2 the 2009/10 actual Treasury Management Indicators are noted.
- 2.3 this Treasury Management Outturn Report and attached appendices are reported to July Council.

3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 The financial implications are contained within the body of the report.

4 CORPORATE PRIORITIES

4.1 This report is for information only and is therefore there are no proposals relating to the Council's Corporate Priorities.

5 THE REPORT

5.1 Performance against the Treasury Management & Prudential Indicators agreed as part of the annual Treasury Management Strategy is provided in Annex 1. The outturn position and all treasury activity undertaken during the financial year is within the limits agreed by Council in February 2009, as shown in Annex 1, as well as the CIPFA Code of Practice and the relevant legislative provisions.

Summary of Returns 2009/10

5.2 The Council's investment position as at 31st March 2010 and performance in 2009/10 is given in Appendices 2 and 3. In line with the Annual Investment Strategy, investments undertaken were temporary short term investments made with reference to the core balance and cash flow requirements.

5.3 Gross interest earned from investments for 2009/10 totalled £1.646m. Net interest received, after deduction of amounts due to the Avon Pension Fund, West of England Growth Points, PCT, schools and other internal balances, is £1.247m. The average rate of interest earned on investments over this period was 1.46%, which is 0.99% above the benchmark rate of average 7 day LIBID + 0.05% (0.47%). This represents an extra £843k of net interest income earned above the benchmark rate.

Summary of Borrowings 2009/10

5.4 The Council's external borrowing as at 31st March 2010 is detailed in Appendix 4. No further borrowing was taken during the year. Following concerns regarding elevated levels of credit risk, falling short term investment rates and in light of the Council's cash balances, the decision was taken to use internal resources rather than external borrowing to finance capital spending during the year. This has the effect of reducing the council's investment balance and the amounts it lends on the money markets to financial institutions, thus providing a significant net saving on capital financing costs.

Strategic & Tactical Decisions

5.5 As detailed in the 2009/10 annual economic review attached at Annex 5, provided by Sterling, the Council's Treasury Advisors, the banking sector remained volatile and we have therefore continued to adopt a cautious strategy in this environment. We have continued to place a significant proportion of our funds with the UK Government Debt Management Office and otherwise with highly-rated major financial institutions, primarily with UK banks, where we assess there is implicit or explicit Government support.

5.6 In line with recent years, the Council continued to take a pro-active risk management approach to its investment decisions during 2009/10 due to the

continued volatility of the financial markets and banking sector. This approach included the following actions

- i) For the first three quarters of the financial year all investments were made in line with the restricted counterparty list approved as part of the 2009/10 treasury management strategy report. Around 20-25% of investments were placed with the UK Government's Debt Management Office (LT rating AAA). Remaining investments were placed with highly rated financial institutions, primarily with UK banks, where it was assessed there was implied or explicit Government support;
- ii) In the final quarter the amount invested with the Debt Management Office was gradually reduced to between 10-15% of total investments as the banking sector stabilised, and two short term investments of £3m each were made with two UK Building Societies (Fitch LT rating A) from the Council's wider counterparty list.

Budget Implications

5.7 An amount of £5.979m was included in the Councils 2009/10 revenue budget for capital financing costs.

5.8 A breakdown of this budget and the actual year end position is included in Appendix 6. This shows an underspend at outturn of £1.075m in 2009/10. The underspend is due to the following factors:

- Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) in respect of debt repayments underspend of £409k due to the final capital spend in 2008/09 being underspent compared to the estimate used in setting the 2009/10 budget for MRP.
- Additional interest earned from the higher ongoing cash balances from 2008/09 and locking in some fixed term investments before a series of base rate cuts totalled £0.673m, which also resulted in a reduction in the requirement to borrow, negating the associated borrowing costs. Higher cash balances were a result of ongoing slippage in the Capital Programme plus higher than anticipated reserves.

6 RISK MANAGEMENT

6.1 The Council's lending & borrowing list has been regularly reviewed during the financial year and credit ratings are monitored throughout the year. All lending/borrowing transactions are within approved limits and with approved institutions. Investment & Borrowing advice is provided by our Treasury Management consultants Sterling.

6.2 The 2009 edition of the CIPFA Treasury Management in the Public Services: Code of Practice requires the Council nominate a committee to be responsible for ensuring effective scrutiny of the Treasury Management Strategy and policies. In May 2010, the Council's treasury advisors provided training to the Corporate Audit Committee to carry out this scrutiny.

6.3 In addition, the Council maintain a risk register for Treasury Management activities, which is regularly reviewed and updated where applicable during the year.

7 EQUALITIES

7.1 This report provides information about the financial performance of the Council and therefore no specific equalities impact assessment has been carried out on the report.

8 RATIONALE

8.1 The Prudential Code and CIPFA's Code of Practice on Treasury Management requires regular monitoring and reporting of Treasury Management activities.

9 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

9.1 None

10 CONSULTATION

10.1 Consultation has been carried out with the Deputy Leader of The Council & Cabinet Member for Resources, Section 151 Finance Officer, Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer.

10.2 Consultation was carried out via e-mail.

11 ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN REACHING THE DECISION

11.1 This report deals with issues of a corporate nature.

12 ADVICE SOUGHT

12.1 The Council's Monitoring Officer (Council Solicitor) and Section 151 Officer (Divisional Director - Finance) have had the opportunity to input to this report and have cleared it for publication.

| | |
|--|--|
| Contact person | <i>Tim Richens - 01225 477468 ; Jamie Whittard - 01225 477213</i> Tim_Richens@bathnes.gov.uk Jamie_Whittard@bathnes.gov.uk |
| Sponsoring Cabinet Member | <i>Councillor Malcolm Hanney</i> |
| Background papers | <i>2009/10 Treasury Management & Investment Strategy</i> <i>Quarterly Treasury Performance Reports (Single Member Decisions)</i> |
| Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format | |

APPENDIX 1

Performance against Treasury Management Indicators agreed in Treasury Management Strategy Statement

1. Authorised limit for external debt

These limits include current commitments and proposals in the budget report for capital expenditure, plus additional headroom over & above the operational limit for unusual cash movements.

| | 2009/10 Prudential Indicator | 2009/10 Actual as at 31st Mar 2010 |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | £'000 | £'000 |
| Borrowing | 85,000 | 80,000 |
| Other long term liabilities | 2,000 | 0 |
| Cumulative Total | 87,000 | 80,000 |

2. Operational limit for external debt

The operational boundary for external debt is based on the same estimates as the authorised limit but without the additional headroom for unusual cash movements.

| | 2009/10 Prudential Indicator | 2009/10 Actual as at 31st Mar 2010 |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | £'000 | £'000 |
| Borrowing | 80,000 | 80,000 |
| Other long term liabilities | 2,000 | 0 |
| Cumulative Total | 82,000 | 80,000 |

3. Upper limit for fixed interest rate exposure

This is the maximum % of total borrowing which can be at fixed interest rate.

| | 2009/10 Prudential Indicator | 2009/10 Actual as at 31st Mar 2010 |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | % | % |
| Fixed interest rate exposure | 100 | 75* |

* The £20m of LOBO's are quoted as variable rate in this analysis as the Lender has the option to change the rate at 6 monthly intervals (the Council has the option to repay the loan should the rate increase)

4. Upper limit for variable interest rate exposure

While fixed rate borrowing contributes significantly to reducing uncertainty surrounding interest rate changes, the pursuit of optimum performance levels may justify keeping a degree of flexibility through the use of variable interest rates. This is the maximum % of total borrowing which can be at variable interest rates.

| | 2009/10 Prudential Indicator | 2009/10 Actual as at 31st Mar 2010 |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| | % | % |
| Variable interest rate exposure | 50 | 25 |

5. Upper limit for total principal sums invested for over 364 days

This is the maximum % of total investments which can be over 364 days.

| | 2009/10 Prudential Indicator | 2009/10 Actual as at 31st Mar 2010 |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| | % | % |
| Investments over 364 days | 80 | 0 |

6. Maturity Structure of new fixed rate borrowing during 2009/10

| | Upper Limit | Lower Limit | 2009/10 Actual as at 31st Mar 2010 |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | % | % | % |
| Under 12 months | 50 | Nil | 0 |
| 12 months and within 24 months | 50 | Nil | 0 |
| 24 months and within 5 years | 50 | Nil | 0 |
| 5 years and within 10 years | 50 | Nil | 0 |
| 10 years and above | 100 | Nil | 0 |

No new borrowing was undertaken in 2009/10.

7. Capital Financing as % of Net Revenue Stream

Estimates for net revenue stream based on estimates of the amounts to be met from government grants and local taxpayers.

| | 2009/10 Prudential Indicator | 2009/10 Provisional as at 31st Mar 2010 |
|--|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Capital Financing as % of Net Revenue Stream | 5.99 | 3.95 |

Note: Capital financing includes the amount paid to Bristol City Council in respect of Ex-Avon Debt.

APPENDIX 2

The Council's Investment position at 31st March 2010

| | Balance at 31 st March 2010 |
|-------------------------------|---|
| | £'000's |
| Notice (instant access funds) | 20,000 |
| Up to 1 month | 14,300 |
| 1 month to 3 months | 10,000 |
| Over 3 months | 25,000 |
| Total | 69,300 |

The investment figure of £69.3 million is made up as follows:

| | £'000's |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| B&NES Council | 37,897 |
| West of England Growth Points | 9,867 |
| Schools | 11,774 |
| Pension Fund | 9,708 |
| Total | 69,300 |

The Council had an average net positive balance of £68.5m (including Growth Points Funding) during the period April 2009 to March 2010.

The following fixed term investments were undertaken during 2009/10 with a maturity date in the following financial year:

| Institution | Amount | Rate | Start Date | Maturity Date | Long Term Credit Rating |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-------|------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Barclays Bank | £5m | 1.35% | 06/11/09 | 06/05/10 | AA- |
| Barclays Bank | £5m | 2.20% | 10/12/09 | 10/12/10 | AA- |
| Lloyds Banking Group | £5m | 1.60% | 28/07/09 | 28/07/10 | A+ |
| Lloyds Banking Group* | £5m | 1.80% | 08/01/10 | 10/01/11 | A+ |
| Bank of Scotland | £5m | 1.35% | 12/01/10 | 12/07/10 | A+ |
| Coventry Building Society | £3m | 0.59% | 04/01/10 | 06/04/10 | A |
| Leeds Building Society | £3m | 0.52% | 04/01/10 | 06/04/10 | A |
| Nationwide Building Society | £5m | 0.74% | 28/01/10 | 28/07/10 | A+ |
| Development Bank of Singapore | £5m | 0.60% | 22/12/09 | 22/06/10 | AA- |
| Debt Management Office | £1.5m | 0.25% | 30/03/10 | 07/04/10 | AAA |
| Debt Management Office | £6.8m | 0.25% | 31/03/10 | 01/04/10 | AAA |
| Total | £49.3m | - | - | - | |

* This loan is classed as a 1 year duration. The reason that it is 367 days is due to there not being any banking activity on a weekend.

APPENDIX 3

Average rate of return for 2009/10

| | Apr % | May % | Jun % | Jul % | Aug % | Sep % |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Average rate of interest earned | 2.13% | 1.80% | 1.74% | 1.77% | 1.86% | 1.63% |
| Benchmark = Average 7 Day LIBID rate +0.05% (source: Sterling) | 0.57% | 0.53% | 0.52% | 0.49% | 0.47% | 0.43% |
| Performance against Benchmark % | +1.56% | +1.27% | +1.22% | +1.28% | +1.39% | +1.20% |

| | Oct % | Nov % | Dec % | Jan % | Feb % | Mar % | Average for Period |
|---|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------------------|
| Average rate of interest earned | 1.29% | 1.16% | 1.01% | 0.88% | 0.84% | 0.87% | 1.46% |
| Benchmark = Average 7 Day LIBID rate +0.05% (source: Sterling) | 0.43% | 0.43% | 0.43% | 0.44% | 0.45% | 0.46% | 0.47% |
| Performance against Benchmark % | +0.86% | +0.73% | +0.58% | 0.44% | 0.39% | 0.41% | +0.99% |

APPENDIX 4

Councils External Borrowing at 31st March 2010

| LONG TERM | Amount | Fixed Term | Interest Rate | Variable Term | Interest Rate |
|------------------|-------------------|------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| PWLB | 10,000,000 | 30 yrs | 4.75% | n/a | n/a |
| PWLB | 20,000,000 | 48 yrs | 4.10% | n/a | n/a |
| PWLB | 10,000,000 | 46 yrs | 4.25% | n/a | n/a |
| PWLB | 10,000,000 | 50 yrs | 3.85% | n/a | n/a |
| PWLB | 10,000,000 | 47 yrs | 4.25% | n/a | n/a |
| KBC Bank N.V* | 5,000,000 | 2 yrs | 3.15% | 48 yrs | 4.5% |
| KBC Bank N.V* | 5,000,000 | 3 yrs | 3.72% | 47 yrs | 4.5% |
| Eurohypo Bank* | 10,000,000 | 3 yrs | 3.49% | 47yrs | 4.5% |
| TOTAL | 80,000,000 | | | | |
| TEMPORARY | NIL | | | | |
| TOTAL | 80,000,000 | | | | |

- All LOBO's (Lender Option / Borrower Option) have reached the end of their fixed interest period and have reverted to the variable rate of 4.5%. The lender has the option to change the interest rate at 6 monthly intervals, however at this point the borrower also has the option to repay the loan without penalty.

APPENDIX 5

Annual Review 2009/10 – (provided by Sterling Treasury Advisors)

By the start of the financial year in April 2009, UK GDP had already contracted approximately 5.3%, due to a sharp fall in private sector spending. The financial crisis in late 2008 had prompted the Government to implement a number of extraordinary government measures, including capital injections in some banks and the Credit Guarantee Scheme, to keep the banking system afloat amidst a wave of mistrust in financial markets.

In an attempt to avoid a more severe recession and possible deflation, the Bank of England had cut Bank Rate to 0.5% in March, where it remained for the whole year. To further loosen monetary policy, the Bank initiated a policy of quantitative easing. By using newly-created central bank reserves to purchase £200bn of government and commercial financial assets, policymakers hoped to stimulate spending and economic activity.

As the financial year progressed and the effects of fiscal and monetary stimulus were more widely felt, the pace of economic contraction gradually declined. House prices recovered following the 20% fall from the 2007 peak and the rate of unemployment slowed. As a consequence, consumer confidence started to recover. However, despite improving business survey evidence, the UK economy continued to contract until quarter four.

Confidence in the financial sector improved in line with better company results, buoyed by higher trading revenues as sentiment improved and credit markets thawed. However, asset impairments continued at elevated levels, and led to losses being reported by some banks. In Europe the European Commission penalised banks that had needed state aid. Some other banks, particularly in the US, repaid government funds.

As a consequence of the recession and the various fiscal stimulus packages, UK Government borrowing soared. By the end of year, the national debt had reached £890bn (62% of GDP) and the annual fiscal deficit was estimated to be £167bn.

The prevailing Bank of England outlook at the end of the year saw the UK economy undergoing anaemic recovery, as weak domestic demand persisted into the medium term. Elevated spare capacity is expected to reduce inflationary pressure, giving the Bank flexibility to maintain loose monetary policy. This could prove useful because the UK and other national governments are under intense pressure to engage in fiscal consolidation, cutting spending and raising taxes in order to control debt levels. Although fears of a double-dip recession may eventually prove unfounded, austerity measures introduced by national governments will weigh on future economic activity.

APPENDIX 6

Capital Financing Costs – Budget Monitoring 2009/10 (Outturn)

| April 2009 to March 2010 | YEAR END POSITION | | | ADV/FAV |
|---|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|
| | Budgeted Spend or (Income) £'000 | Actual Spend or (Income) £'000 | Actual over or (under) spend £'000 | |
| Interest & Capital Financing | | | | |
| - Debt Costs | 2,418 | 2,421 | 3 | ADV |
| - Ex Avon Debt Costs | 1,740 | 1,744 | 4 | ADV |
| - Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) | 2,395 | 1,986 | (409) | FAV |
| - Interest on Balances | (574) | (1,247) | (673) | FAV |
| Sub Total - Capital Financing | 5,979 | 4,904 | (1,075) | FAV |

| Bath & North East Somerset Council | | |
|--|--|--|
| MEETING: | Cabinet | |
| MEETING DATE: | 21st July 2010 | AGENDA ITEM NUMBER 15 |
| TITLE: | Revenue & Capital Outturn 2009/10 | EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE: E 2125 |
| WARD: | All | |
| AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM | | |
| <p>List of attachments to this report:</p> <p>Appendix 1: Revenue & Capital Outturn 2009/10 information</p> <p>Appendix 2: Provisional Revenue Outturn by Portfolio 2009/10</p> <p>Appendix 3: Reasons for Revenue Budget Variances 2009/10</p> <p>Appendix 4: Revenue Budget Items to be considered for carry forward/write-off</p> <p>Appendix 5: Revenue Virements 2009/10 & 2010/11</p> <p>Appendix 6: Provisional Capital Outturn by Portfolio 2009/10</p> <p>Appendix 7: Detailed Capital Variance & Rephasing Requests 2009/10</p> <p>Appendix 8: Capital Programme 2010/11 Approvals</p> <p>Appendix 9: Capital Programme by Portfolio 2009/10 & 2010/11</p> <p>Appendix 10: Capital Virements 2009/10 to 2013/14</p> | | |

1 THE ISSUE

1.1 The report presents the provisional revenue and capital outturn for 2009/10.

1.2 The report refers to requests to carry forward specific revenue budget items to 2010/11, transfers to earmarked reserves and to write-off revenue overspends where recovery in future years would have an adverse impact on continuing service delivery.

1.3 The report also refers to requests to rephrase specific capital budget items and to write off capital underspends in 2009/10 and to approve specific capital budget items in the 2010/11 capital programme.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

The Cabinet agrees that:

- 2.1 The provisional revenue budget outturn for 2009/10 as set out in Appendix 2 is noted.
- 2.2 The revenue carry forward proposals and write-off requests listed in the tables in Appendix 4 as exceptions to the Budget Management Scheme are approved.
- 2.3 The Revenue Budget Contingency is increased by £2.290m and that earmarked reserves totalling £214k related to the Carbon Management and Procurement Programmes as detailed in Appendix 1 paragraph 1.13 are created.
- 2.4 The revenue virements for 2009/10 and 2010/11 as listed in Appendix 5(i) & 5(iii) are approved.
- 2.5 The resulting reserves position shown in Appendix 1 paragraph 1.14 is noted and that unearmarked reserves remain at the target level of £10.5m
- 2.6 The provisional outturn of the 2009/10 capital programme in Appendix 6, and the funding as laid out in the table in Appendix 1 Paragraph 1.24, is noted.
- 2.7 The capital rephasing as listed in Appendix 7 is approved.
- 2.8 The capital programme 2010/11 items as detailed in Appendix 8 are approved.
- 2.9 The adjustments to the 2009/10 to 2013/14 capital programme as detailed in Appendix 10, and the final capital programme for 2009/10 in Appendix 9 are noted.
- 2.10 The use of growth points funding in 2009/10 is noted, and the proposed approach for 2010/11 as set out in Appendix 1 paragraph 1.27, is agreed.
- 2.11 The efficiencies achieved during 2009/10 as described in 5.9 below are noted.

3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 These are contained throughout the Report and Appendices.

4 CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- 4.1 The Medium Term Finance & Planning process allocates scarce resources across services with alignment of these resources towards our corporate improvement priorities as set out in the Corporate Plan. This report monitors how the Council is performing against the financial targets set in February 2009 through the budget setting report.

5 THE REPORT

5.1 This report provides information about the Council's financial performance against its revenue and capital budgets in 2009/10.

5.2 This report enables Cabinet to review:

- Requests for write-off of overspends
- Requests for carry forward of underspends
- Suggested earmarking of reserves

These issues need to be considered in the context of the reserves strategy, with reserves already at target levels, and the risks emerging in light of the emerging national public sector financial position, recent announcements specifying cuts to local government grants in 2010/11, and the further potential financial impacts likely in the Chancellor's budget which will be announced in June 2010.

5.3 The report identifies that before any carry forwards or transfers to reserves, the Council underspent by £1,805,000, equating to 0.6% of the Council's gross revenue budget (excluding DSG) for 2009/10. This represents a significant achievement in the context of the current public sector financial climate and will reinforce the prudent financial approach being taken by the Council.

5.4 Details of and commentary on the outturn position for the revenue and capital budgets are provided in Appendices 1-10.

5.5 The Corporate Audit Committee will approve the statutory final accounts of the Council. This report presents the provisional 2009/10 outturn in the form that is routinely reported throughout the year as part of budget monitoring.

5.6 The Cabinet received financial reports throughout the year highlighting the known pressure areas, and identifying those actions that could be taken to reduce these to manageable proportions.

5.7 A Budget Management Scheme (BMS) is in force, which specifies how over and under spending should be treated in any year.

5.8 Under the Budget Management Scheme all revenue overspends should be carried forward, subject to a proposal from the service to recover them. At least 60% of any revenue underspends can also be carried forward providing that the management of all overspendings have been agreed within Strategic Directors' service areas and also providing these underspends were reported at January 2010. If not reported by then, they are considered "windfall" and should not be carried forward unless the Cabinet expressly approves.

5.9 The Council is required to report its ongoing cashable efficiencies achieved each year for National Indication 179: Value for Money. The cumulative target for 2008/09 & 2009/10 was £9.774m (or 6.1% of the revenue & capital baseline). The actual efficiencies achieved as at the end of 2009/10 was £10.452m (6.5%).

6 RISK MANAGEMENT

6.1 The substance of this report is part of the Council's risk management process. The key risks in the Council's budget are assessed annually by each Strategic Director, with these risks re-assessed on a monthly basis as part of the budget monitoring process.

7 EQUALITIES

7.1 This report provides information about the financial performance of the Council and therefore no specific equalities impact assessment has been carried out on the report.

8 RATIONALE

8.1 The recommendations made are based upon the Budget Management Scheme and a consideration of the Council's latest financial position and reserves strategy.

9 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

9.1 Appendix 4 lists all options that can be considered in making a decision on carry forwards and write offs from 2009/10 to 2010/11.

10 CONSULTATION

10.1 Consultation has been carried out with the Deputy Leader of The Council & Cabinet Member for Resources, Strategic Directors, Section 151 Finance Officer, Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer.

10.2 The provisional outturn report has been discussed at Strategic Directors' Group and Divisional Directors' Group during June.

11 ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN REACHING THE DECISION

11.1 This report deals with issues of a corporate nature.

12 ADVICE SOUGHT

12.1 The Council's Monitoring Officer (Council Solicitor), Section 151 Officer (Strategic Director – Resources & Support Services), Strategic Directors' Group & Divisional Directors' Group have had the opportunity to input to this report and have cleared it for publication.

| | |
|--|---|
| Contact person | <i>Tim Richens - 01225 477468 ; Jamie Whittard - 01225 477213 ; Tim_Richens@bathnes.gov.uk Jamie_Whittard@bathnes.gov.uk</i> |
| Sponsoring Cabinet Member | <i>Councillor Malcolm Hanney</i> |
| Background papers | <i>2009/10 Budget Monitoring reports to the Cabinet; Budget Management Scheme</i> |
| Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format | |

REVENUE OUTURN 2009/10

- 1.1 Appendix 2 outlines the Council's provisional financial outturn for the 2009/10 financial year. Despite a number of major pressures during 2009/10, the provisional outturn shows the budget has been managed in total with an under spend/surplus. Before any carry forwards or transfers to reserves, the Council underspent by £1,805,000, equating to 0.6% of the Council's gross revenue budget (excluding DSG) for 2009/10.
- 1.2 In addition, the bottom line out-turn position in relation to schools is an overspend of £652,000, while the LEA/DSG element has an underspend of £958,000. Both of these are automatically carried forward under the DSG arrangements, and hence these figures are excluded from this report.
- 1.3 Underlying the Council's "bottom line" figure are a number of variations (at a Directorate level):
- Service overspends of £1.846m
 - Service underspends of £0.859m
 - In addition to the net overspend of £0.987m at Directorate level, there is a £2.792m underspend on Corporate and Agency budgets mainly related to capital financing costs and investment income, and inflation provisions that were not required during the year.
- 1.4 The Council has used a robust action plan system for addressing Service overspends, which were monitored on a monthly basis, and has helped offset some of the previously reported spending pressures. Significant pressures in Customer Services & the Children's Services care placement costs at the bottom line level during the financial year were contained.
- 1.5 The explanations for the 2009/10 outturn variations are given in Appendix 3, and some are highlighted below.
- 1.6 The main area contributing to the underspend are:
- Capital financing costs and investment interest:
Additional investment interest was earned due to higher than anticipated cash balances with higher interest rates achieved. The Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) in respect of debt repayments was lower than budgeted, mainly due to rephasing of capital spend into future years. More details are provided in the Treasury Management Outturn report elsewhere on the agenda.
- Corporate Budgets – Pay inflation, Super inflation and VAT Refunds:
Underspends arose due to the 2009/10 pay award being settled at a lower rate than budgeted for, remaining inflation provisions related to utilities, insurance and recycling not being required due to proactive procurement and one-off VAT refunds relating to leisure admissions and tuition fees.
- 1.7 The main areas of overspending have occurred in the Customer Services and Children's Services Portfolios. There was a small overspend in the Adult

Social Services & Housing Portfolio, and there were underspends in all the other Portfolios. However there are wide variations between services within those broad headings.

DECISIONS REQUIRED RELATING TO OVER AND UNDERSPENDS

- 1.8 Decisions are needed on some of the items in Appendix 4 relating to under and overspending in 2009/10. Each section of Appendix 4 is clearly marked for information or for decision. In particular, decisions are required in Tables 2 and 3 of Appendix 4. If all these items are approved, this would give a final underspend of £1,489,000.
- 1.9 After allowing for the earmarked reserves referred to in paragraph 1.13 and other transfers to reserves detailed in 1.11 below, the net amount returned to unearmarked reserves would be £nil.
- 1.10 Table 3 of Appendix 4 contains requests to write off overspends as an exception to the Budget Management Scheme rules, which would require recovery by service over a maximum of 3 years. The write offs are requested as it is not considered practical to recover these overspends against the continuing risk of overspending in 2010/11 and future years.

OTHER 2009/10 MOVEMENTS AFFECTING RESERVES

- 1.11 The net underspend position of £1,489,000 reported above does not include the following unbudgeted transactions, which are one-off in nature, or relate to previous years so are reported separately from the regular monitoring figures:

| Item | Amount (-ve = increase in reserves) £k | Description |
|---|---|---|
| Provision for 2009/10 Overspend | -370 | Removal of earmarked reserve covering potential net revenue overspends arising in 2009/10. |
| General Bad Debt Provision | 38 | Increase in Council's general bad debt provision following review as part of closedown activities. |
| Capital Repayment | -81 | Service repayment of previous capital overspend related to Automatic Public conveniences |
| Other minor transactions | -14 | Avon & Somerset Magistrates loan repayment, VAT adjustments and other small transactions. |
| Un-earmarking of reserve | -121 | Transfer of amounts from revenue contribution to capital reserve where not used to fund capital expenditure. |
| Dissolving the Exceptional Risk Reserve | -467 | Amount above February 2010 budget report from dissolving the Exceptional Risk Reserve with the exception of the Recession Reserve |
| Total | -1,015k | Increase in un-earmarked reserves |

1.12 The net effect of the above transaction is an increase in unearmarked reserves of £1,015k.

USE OF UNDERSPEND TO MAKE EARMARKED RESERVES

1.13 The Cabinet may wish to take this opportunity to make the following provision within balances for potential costs which could arise, and which are not allowed for in the budget agreed during February 2010:

- Increase in Revenue Budget Contingency Reserve: £2.290m.
- Create an earmarked reserve for the corporate Carbon Management Programme: £144k.
- Create an earmarked reserve for the corporate Procurement Programme: £70k.

The last two items relate to specific underspends in 2009/10 and recognise that there is a corporate programme of work over several years.

The proposed transfer to the Revenue Budget Contingency reflects the risks to the revenue budget in light of the emerging national public sector financial position, recent announcements specifying cuts to local government grants in 2010/11, and the further potential financial impacts likely in the Chancellor's budget which will be announced in June 2010.

REVENUE RESERVES

1.14 If the requests shown in recommendations 2.2 and 2.3 are approved by the Cabinet, the overall situation would be as follows:

| Description of the Revenue Reserves Movements | £'000 |
|--|---------------|
| Estimated General Reserves 1 st April 2010 before outturn movements (February Budget Report 2010) | 18,920 |
| Transfers in 2010/11 as agreed by Council (February 2010 Budget Report) | -8,440 |
| Estimated General Reserves following February Budget Report 2010 | 10,480 |
| Net transfers into reserve (see paragraph 1.11) | +1,015 |
| 2009/10 Outturn position, including additional use in carry forward of underspends and write off of overspends (recommendation 2.2) | +1,489 |
| Increase in earmarked Revenue Budget Contingency Reserve (recommendation 2.3) | -2,290 |
| Creation of earmarked Carbon Management & Procurement Programme reserves (recommendation 2.3) | -214 |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Remaining available reserves would then be | 10,480 |
| <i>Recommended optimal level based on corporate risk assessment</i> | 10,480 |

1.15 As a result, the Council is meeting the reserves strategy outlined in the budget report to Council on 16th February 2010.

1.16 The balances held by schools have decreased by £652k from £3.736m to £3.084m.

COLLECTION FUND OUTTURN POSITION

1.17 As part of the 2010/11 Budget, an estimate was made on the position of the Council Tax Collection Fund as at the 31st March 2010. The estimate was for a surplus of £1.000m, of which the Council's share was £0.846m (the balance is paid to the Police and Fire Authorities). The actual outturn position on the Collection Fund for 2009/10 is a surplus of £1.149m (the Council's share is £0.973m).

CAPITAL OUTTURN 2009/10

1.18 The capital spend was £12.8m less than the 2009/10 revised budget, of which £2.7m related to Combe Down Stone Mines (CDSM).

1.19 Services are requesting rephasing of variances (project slippage and net in-year overspends) to 2010/11 of £8.0m, which includes £2.4m for CDSM (see Appendix 7). It is proposed to write off the remaining underspends and budget adjustments of £2.4m and rephase £2.3m of Children's Services grants (funding streams) into italics.

1.20 Details of the overall capital outturn position are given in Appendix 6, with detail on rephasing requests and over/underspends in Appendix 7.

1.21 Generally, much financial slippage was incorporated in the 2010/11 budget setting, with £13m slipped at that time (£15m in 2009/10 budget setting). While the report reflects financial slippage, major projects are still completing on time and on budget.

CAPITAL RESOURCES

1.22 The 2009/10 budgeted figure for capital receipts assumed Right to Buy (RTB) receipts of £1m from Somer Housing Association, General Fund receipts of £2.0m and Children's Services earmarked receipts of £1.1m, giving estimated receipts of £4.1m. Actual receipts achieved, net of costs, were RTB sale receipts of £0.6m, General Fund receipts of £3.6m and Children's Services earmarked receipts of £0.5m.

1.23 The current position is that, from 1 April 2008, non scheme-specific receipts are earmarked to Public Realm Improvements and property maintenance, and receipts from the schools' estate are earmarked for School Improvements.

1.24 The Council is also required to report how the 2009/10 programme is to be financed (including the £22.0m of grant funded Stone Mines). This is as follows:

| | £'000 |
|--------------------------------|---------------|
| Total Capital Spending: | 73,907 |
| Funded by: | |
| Supported Borrowing | 6,003 |
| Capital Receipts | 4,657 |
| Capital Grants | 62,060 |
| 3 rd Party Receipts | 589 |
| Revenue | 598 |
| Unsupported Borrowing | 0 |

1.25 The £598k of revenue funding is predominantly in respect of the IT investment programme.

1.26 B&NES is Accountable Body for the Growth Points Fund on behalf of the West of England. In 2009/10 capital grant of £6.4m was received from DCLG. Of this £1.5m was distributed to individual UAs to fund specific projects. £0.5m revenue grant was received for 2009/10 which is being used to strengthen the capacity of the West of England.

1.27 The use of B&NES Growth Points capital allocation has been earmarked for the City Information System (Public Realm) and Bath Western Riverside. This will need to be reviewed in light of the current public sector austerity measures.

APPROVAL OF CAPITAL PROJECTS

1.28 As explained in the Council Report of February 2009, there were a number of items included in 'italics' which were not approved at the time, due to a requirement either to be signed off through the Capital Review process or where further work was required on how a funding stream should be spent. A number of these items have now progressed to the stage where they require approval, and are included in Appendix 8.

This page is intentionally left blank

Financial Monitoring Statement (Revenue): All Portfolios

APPENDIX 2

| REVENUE SPENDING | YEAR END FINAL FIGURES | | | Automatic Carry forward of Underspend (table 1) Col 4 | Carry forwards overspends under the BMS Rules (table 3 & 4) Col 5 £'000 | Requested by Strategic Directors | | Net Col 8 £'000 |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|------------------------------|
| | Actual Spend or (Income) Col 1 £'000 | Budgeted Spend or (Income) Col 2 £'000 | Outturn over or (under) spend Col 3 £'000 | | | Requested carry forward Underspend (table 2) Col 6 £'000 | Write off overspend (table 3) Col 7 £'000 | |
| All Portfolios For period to 31st March 2010 | | | | | | | | |
| Customer Services | 32,181 | 31,263 | 918 | | (918) | | 918 | 918 |
| Children Services | 25,573 | 24,861 | 712 | | (712) | 107 | 712 | 820 |
| Adult Social Services & Housing | 46,814 | 46,677 | 137 | | (137) | 109 | 137 | 246 |
| Resources | 15,718 | 19,215 | (3,497) | | | 100 | | (3,397) |
| Development & Major Projects | 1,990 | 2,067 | (76) | | | | | (76) |
| TOTAL | 122,277 | 124,082 | (1,805) | | (1,768) | 316 | 1,768 | (1,489) |
| Note: "ADV" indicates an adverse variance, "FAV" a favourable variance, and a "(" in the over and under spend columns indicates an underspend or overachievement of income | | | | | | | | |
| Earmarked Reserves for Carbon Management & Procurement | | | | | | | | 214 |
| Below the line transactions affecting reserves | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Position (negative = increase in reserves) | | | | | | | | (1,275) |

This page is intentionally left blank

Council Overall Revenue Budget Monitor
Financial Monitoring Statement: All Portfolios

APPENDIX 3

| REVENUE SPENDING All Portfolios For period to | YEAR END ACTUAL | | | ADV/FAV | Notes on main areas of over / under spending |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------|--|
| | Actual Spend or (Income) | Budgeted Spend or (Income) | Over or (under) spend | | |
| | A £'000 | B £'000 | C £'000 | | |
| 31st March 2010 | | | | | |
| Customer Services | | | | | |
| Transport Design & Projects | 1,127 | 1,034 | 92 | ADV | Historic budget pressures from 2008/09 including under recovery of Geographical Information System costs. |
| Transportation Planning (incl. Public Transport) | 5,910 | 6,057 | (147) | FAV | One-off income from traffic studies and grants, plus savings on salary costs. |
| Park & Ride | (705) | (876) | 171 | ADV | Park & Ride income below budgeted levels. |
| Planning Services | 3,745 | 3,388 | 357 | ADV | Historic base budget pressure from 2008/09 reduced by vacancy savings which preceeded fuller staff review. Reduced applications gave rise to shortfall in income, mitigated by some rephasing of policy making budgets into 2010/11. |
| Building Control & Land Charges | 20 | 40 | (20) | FAV | |
| Highways Network Maintenance | 6,741 | 6,689 | 52 | ADV | |
| Highways - Transport & Fleet Management | (245) | (49) | (195) | FAV | Additional grant (claim including backdating to previous years) & fee income. |
| Customer Services - Overheads | 861 | 674 | 187 | ADV | General savings target for lean review held here, achieved through actions elsewhere in specific services. |
| Car Parking (excluding Park & Ride) | (5,940) | (6,244) | 303 | ADV | Parking income below budgeted levels. |
| Waste | 9,713 | 10,237 | (524) | FAV | Favourable disposal income prices and base budget realignments, particular in strategy. Higher costs on green waste disposal mitigated by collection re-design. |
| Public Protection | 1,243 | 1,026 | 217 | ADV | One-off restructuring pension costs to generate savings in future years. |
| Neighbourhood Services | 5,814 | 5,303 | 511 | ADV | One-off restructuring pension costs to generate savings in future years, plus on-going 2008/09 budget pressures. |
| Customer Access | 1,856 | 1,934 | (78) | FAV | Staff and IT overhead cost savings. |
| Libraries & Information | 2,487 | 2,500 | (13) | FAV | |
| Arts | 645 | 646 | (1) | FAV | |
| Tourism & Destination Management | 1,168 | 1,175 | (8) | FAV | |
| Heritage including Archives | (3,201) | (3,198) | (3) | FAV | |
| Leisure - Sports & Active Leisure | 943 | 926 | 17 | ADV | |
| Sub Total | 32,181 | 31,263 | 918 | ADV | |
| Children's Services | | | | | |
| Children, Young People & Families | 12,150 | 11,603 | 547 | ADV | The net overspend is due mainly to increased Children in Care costs resulting from an increase in volume & complexity of placements, and the costs associated with the closure of Training Services. |
| Education & Schools' Budget | 13,423 | 13,259 | 165 | | |
| Sub Total | 25,573 | 24,861 | 712 | ADV | |

| REVENUE SPENDING All Portfolios For period to | YEAR END ACTUAL | | | ADV/FAV | Notes on main areas of over / under spending |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------|---|
| | Actual Spend or (Income) | Budgeted Spend or (Income) | Over or (under) spend | | |
| | A £'000 | B £'000 | C £'000 | | |
| 31st March 2010 | | | | | |
| Adult Social Services & Housing | | | | | |
| Adult Services | 41,797 | 41,577 | 220 | ADV | Mainly due to pressures for Learning Difficulties & Mental Health externally purchased placements. |
| Advice Service | 1,912 | 1,978 | (66) | FAV | Review of service provided resulted in savings. |
| Employment Development | 244 | 234 | 10 | ADV | |
| Community Learning | 131 | 126 | 5 | ADV | |
| Adult Substance Misuse | 596 | 596 | | ON TARGET | |
| Housing | 2,133 | 2,165 | (32) | FAV | |
| Sub Total | 46,814 | 46,677 | 137 | ADV | |
| Development & Major Projects | | | | | |
| Major Projects Support | 253 | 648 | (395) | FAV | A reduction in consultant fees due to contracts ended in March, plus staff costs recharged to capital greater than anticipated. |
| Development & Regeneration | 1,737 | 1,419 | 318 | ADV | |
| Sub Total | 1,990 | 2,067 | (76) | FAV | |
| Resources | | | | | |
| Policy & Partnerships | 2,793 | 2,879 | (86) | FAV | Underspend in Carbon Management Programme, partially offset against £50k overpend in Standards & Support Team. |
| Property Services | 1,055 | 1,302 | (248) | FAV | Agency & Development underspend, Business Rates payments review and some savings on vacant posts. |
| Corporate Estate incl. Repairs & Maintenance | 6,556 | 6,782 | (226) | FAV | |
| Traded Services | 101 | 60 | 42 | ADV | Shortfall in rental income and increased bad debt provision. |
| Commercial Estate | (12,392) | (12,465) | 73 | ADV | |
| Finance | 1,518 | 1,526 | (8) | FAV | |
| Revenues & Benefits | 1,227 | 1,234 | (7) | FAV | Mainly due to slippage in Procurement Programme and one off rebate from Agency Staff provider. |
| Risk & Assurance Services | 988 | 1,182 | (194) | FAV | |
| Transformation Programme | 1,196 | 1,196 | | ON TARGET | |
| Council's Retained ICT Budgets | (1,011) | (1,011) | | ON TARGET | |
| Communications & Marketing | 650 | 654 | (4) | FAV | |
| Performance Development | 864 | 885 | (20) | FAV | |
| Chief Executive | 424 | 449 | (25) | FAV | |
| Human Resources | 1,019 | 973 | 47 | ADV | |
| Council Solicitor & Democratic Services | 2,466 | 2,515 | (49) | FAV | |

Council Overall Revenue Budget Monitor
Financial Monitoring Statement: All Portfolios

APPENDIX 3

| REVENUE SPENDING All Portfolios For period to | YEAR END ACTUAL | | | ADV/FAV | Notes on main areas of over / under spending |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------|--|
| | Actual Spend or (Income) | Budgeted Spend or (Income) | Over or (under) spend | | |
| | A £'000 | B £'000 | C £'000 | | |
| 31st March 2010 | | | | | |
| Hsg / Council Tax Benefits Subsidy | 48 | 355 | (307) | FAV | High recovery levels in benefit overpayments. |
| Capital Financing / Interest | 4,904 | 5,979 | (1,075) | FAV | Reduced debt provision (MRP) and higher investment income mainly as a result of 2008/09 lower capital spend and increased levels of reserves |
| Unfunded Pensions | 1,722 | 1,634 | 88 | ADV | Inflation indexing costs and demographic impacts of pensioners longevity. |
| Other Misc Budgets | 988 | 2,554 | (1,566) | FAV | Mainly due to lower than budgeted pay award, super inflation provision on energy & insurance not being required, VAT refunds for Leisure admissions and tuition fees, partially offset by Midland Road capital scheme costs charged to revenue. |
| Magistrates | 21 | 22 | (1) | FAV | |
| Coroners | 382 | 312 | 70 | ADV | This represents the Council's share of Coroners costs which are managed by Bristol CC. The overspend relates to costs of employing an acting coroner during the suspension of the current coroner and additional costs of operating the new mortuary facility. |
| Environment Agency | 197 | 199 | (2) | FAV | |
| Sub Total | 15,718 | 19,215 | (3,497) | FAV | |
| TOTAL | 122,277 | 124,082 | (1,805) | FAV | |
| <p>Note: "ADV" indicates an adverse variance, "FAV" a favourable variance, and a "(" in the over and under spend columns indicates an underspend or overachievement of income</p> | | | | | |

This page is intentionally left blank

**Budget Items to be considered for carry forward to
2010/11**

**TABLE 1: Over and under spends already approved under
Budget Management scheme (BMS) and Statutory
Requirements (SR)**

This table is for **information** - no decision is required

| Under spend Carry Forward Requests - approved under rules of BMS – 2009/10 to 2010/11 or already agreed by the Cabinet | Requested approval £ | Already Approved under BMS/ SR £ | Director |
|---|---------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| <u>Children's Service Portfolio</u> | | | |
| The Dedicated Schools' Grant is ring-fenced, the under spend will be automatically carried forward into 2010/11. | 958,380 | 958,380 | AA |
| Total (Net position) | 958,380 | 958,380 | |

Appendix 4 (cont)

TABLE 2:
For Decision - Under spend carry forward requests not automatically approved

| Under spend Carry Forward Requests - those <u>not</u> approved under rules of BMS – 2009/10 to 2010/11 | Requested approval £ | Already Approved under BMS £ | Dir | Reported by BMS Deadline (Jan'10) |
|--|----------------------|------------------------------|-----|-----------------------------------|
| <u>Children's Services Portfolio</u> | | | | |
| (ChS1) – Extended Services – Area Based Grant – contractual payments aligned with academic year so carry forward required to fund commitments to July 2010. | 107,000 | | AA | Yes |
| <u>Adult Social Service & Housing Portfolio</u> | | | | |
| (AS1) – Adult Social Care Workforce (Training Area Based) Funds Earmarked to cover training required re "Safeguarding" as the revised training strategy and programme originally planned for 2009/10 was delayed as the Safeguarding Adults Inter-Agency Policy, Procedure and manual was revised and will be implemented in early 2010/11. | 109,000 | | JR | Yes |
| <u>Corporate Budgets (Resources Portfolio)</u> | | | | |
| (CA1) – Independent Safeguarding Authority – Delay to July 2010 for national implementation of Independent Safeguarding Authority checks. | 100,000 | | AP | Yes |
| TABLE 2 TOTAL | 316,000 | | | |

Appendix 4 (continued)

TABLE 3:
For Decision - Requests for overspend write off from services in 2009/10

| Requests to write off overspends | Request £ | Already approved under BMS £ | Director |
|---|----------------------|---|-----------------|
| <u>Customer Services</u> Net position on Customer Services | 996,000 | | GC |
| <u>Children's Services</u> Net position on Children's Services. | 712,000 | | AA |
| <u>Adult Social Services & Housing</u> Net position on Adult Social Services & Housing. | 137,000 | | JR |
| Total | 1,845,000 | 0 | |

This column lists the figures requested

This column indicates where figures are approved within the rules of BMS. If no figure it will need decision to approve it

This page is intentionally left blank

2009/2010 Revenue Virements for Approval

| REF NO | REASON / EXPLANATION | CABINET MEMBER | TRANSFER FROM | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | CABINET MEMBER | TRANSFER TO | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | DESCRIPTION | ONGOING EFFECTS |
|---|----------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| | | | CASHLIM | | | | CASHLIM | | | | |
| The following virements are reported for approval under the Budget Management Scheme rules. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL TOTALS | | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | |

2009/2010 Revenue Virements for Information

| REF NO | REASON / EXPLANATION | CABINET MEMBER | TRANSFER FROM | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | CABINET MEMBER | TRANSFER TO | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | DESCRIPTION | ONGOING EFFECTS |
|--|----------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| | | | CASHLIM | | | | CASHLIM | | | | |
| The following virements have either been previously approved, are technical in nature or are below limits within BMS that require approval, and therefore are reported for information only. | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|--|----------------|--------------------------|--|--------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| INFO 09#42 | Recession Reserve drawdown for Customer Services income budgets. | Resources [MH] | Exceptional Risk Reserve | | 300,000 [CG] | Customer Services [CG] | Planning Services Building Control & Land Charges Car Parking (excluding Park & Ride) | | 100,000 89,000 111,000 | Drawdown from Recession Reserve for lower income than budgeted in Customer Services, as approved by 3rd March 2010 Cabinet. | Budget virement is one-off. |
| INFO 09#43 | Business Improvement allocation from Recession Reserve | Resources [MH] | Exceptional Risk Reserve | | 10,000 | Development & Major Projects [TG] | Development & Regeneration | | 10,000 | Drawdown from Recession Reserve for Business Improvement, as approved by Director of Resources & Support Services. | Budget virement is one-off. |
| INFO 09#44 | Somer Valley FM drawdown from Recession Reserve | Resources [MH] | Exceptional Risk Reserve | | 25,000 | Development & Major Projects [TG] | Development & Regeneration | | 25,000 | Drawdown from Recession Reserve for one-off grant to Somer Valley FM as approved by Director of Resources & Support Services. | Budget virement is one-off. |
| INFO 09#45 | Casino Drawdown from earmarked reserve | Resources [MH] | Council Balances | | 65,000 | Development & Major Projects [TG] | Development & Regeneration | | 65,000 | Drawdown from earmarked Casino Reserve. | Budget virement is one-off. |
| INFO 09#46 | Christmas Lights drawdown from Recession Reserve | Resources [MH] | Exceptional Risk Reserve | | 25,226 | Customer Services [CG] | Tourism & Destination Management | | 25,226 | Drawdown from Recession Reserve for one-off funding of Christmas Lights as approved by Director of Resources & Support Services, as approved by Director of Resources & Support Services 29th March 2010. | Budget virement is one-off. |

REF NO **REASON / EXPLANATION** **CABINET MEMBER** **TRANSFER FROM** **CASH/LIM** **Income (£'s)** **Expenditure (£'s)** **CABINET MEMBER** **TRANSFER TO** **CASH/LIM** **Income (£'s)** **Expenditure (£'s)** **DESCRIPTION** **ONGOING EFFECTS**

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|-----------|----------------|---|--|--|-----------|---|-----------------------------|------------------|--|
| INFO 09#47 | Change in PCT contribution to Pooled Budget | Adult Social Services & Housing [VP] | Adult Services | | | 2,000,000 | Resources [MH] | Council Balances | | | 2,000,000 | Due to its financial position, the PCT is making an additional contribution to the pooled budget in 2009/10 with an equal offsetting reduction in the Council's contribution. | Budget virement is one-off. | | |
| INFO 09#48 | Area Based Grant Correction | Resources [MH] | Policy & Partnerships | | | 1,833 | Resources [MH] | Council Solicitor & Democratic Services | | | 1,833 | Cash Limit Correction to Area Based Grant allocation for Community Call For Action O&S Committee | Budget virement is ongoing. | | |
| INFO 09#49 | Members Parking Permits | Customer Services [CG] | Car Parking (Excluding Park & Ride) | | | 98,000 | Resources [MH] | Council Solicitor & Democratic Services | | | 98,000 | Re-alignment of income and expenditure budgets for Members' parking permits reflecting higher charges. | Budget virement is ongoing. | | |
| INFO 09#50 | Finance Support Recharges | Resources [MH] | Property Services | | | 45,000 | Resources [MH] | Finance | | | 45,000 | Reduction in Finance recharge target due to re-allocation of work following finance restructure. | Budget virement is ongoing. | | |
| INFO 09#51 | Community Governance Norton Radstock | Resources [MH] | Revenue Contingency | | | 5,450 | Resources [MH] | Council Solicitor & Democratic Services | | | 5,450 | Drawdown of part of allocation from Revenue Contingency, as agreed by Cabinet 2nd September 2009. | Budget virement is one-off. | | |
| OVERALL TOTALS | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 2,605,509 | 0 | 2,605,509 | |

Portfolio Cash Limits 2009/10 - Revenue Budgets
Appendix 5 (ii)

| CABINET PORTFOLIO | Service | 2009/10 Revised Cashlimit - Mar'10 | Technical Adjustments, below BMS limits or already agreed - shown for information | Total Virements For Approval | 2009/10 Revised Cashlimit - Mar'10 |
|---|--|------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 |
| Customer Services | Transport Design & Projects | 1,034 | | | 1,034 |
| | Transportation Planning (including Public Transport) | 6,057 | | | 6,057 |
| | Park & Ride | (876) | | | (876) |
| | Planning Services | 3,288 | 100 | | 3,388 |
| | Building Control & Land Charges | (49) | 89 | | 40 |
| | Highways - Network Maintenance | 6,689 | | | 6,689 |
| | Highways - Transport & Fleet Management | (49) | | | (49) |
| | Customer Service - Overheads | 674 | | | 674 |
| | Car Parking (excluding Park & Ride) | (6,257) | 13 | | (6,244) |
| | Waste | 10,237 | | | 10,237 |
| | Public Protection | 1,026 | | | 1,026 |
| | Neighbourhood Services | 5,303 | | | 5,303 |
| | Customer Access | 1,934 | | | 1,934 |
| | Libraries & Information | 2,499 | | | 2,499 |
| | Arts | 646 | | | 646 |
| | Tourism & Destination Management | 1,150 | 25 | | 1,175 |
| | Heritage including Archives | (3,198) | | | (3,198) |
| | Sports & Active Leisure | 926 | | | 926 |
| PORTFOLIO SUB TOTAL | 31,035 | 227 | | 31,262 | |
| Children's Services | Children, Young People & Families | 11,603 | | | 11,603 |
| | Learning Inclusion | 14,319 | | | 14,319 |
| | Children's Services Strategic Planning | (105,387) | | | (105,387) |
| | Schools Budget | 104,326 | | | 104,326 |
| PORTFOLIO SUB TOTAL | 24,861 | | | 24,861 | |
| Adult Social Services & Housing | Adult Services | 45,555 | (2,000) | | 43,555 |
| | Housing | 2,165 | | | 2,165 |
| | Drug Action Team | 596 | | | 596 |
| | Community Learning | 126 | | | 126 |
| | Employment Development | 234 | | | 234 |
| PORTFOLIO SUB TOTAL | 48,677 | (2,000) | | 46,677 | |
| Resources | Finance | 1,481 | 45 | | 1,526 |
| | Revenues & Benefits | 1,234 | | | 1,234 |
| | Transformation Service | 1,196 | | | 1,196 |
| | Council's Retained ICT Budgets | (1,011) | | | (1,011) |
| | Risk & Assurance Services | 1,182 | | | 1,182 |
| | Property Services | 1,347 | (45) | | 1,302 |
| | Corporate Estate Including R&M | 6,782 | | | 6,782 |
| | Commercial Estate | (12,465) | | | (12,465) |
| | Traded Services | 60 | | | 60 |
| | Policy & Partnerships | 2,881 | (2) | | 2,879 |
| | Performance Development | 885 | | | 885 |
| | Human Resources | 973 | | | 973 |
| | Chief Executive | 449 | | | 449 |
| | Communications & Marketing | 654 | | | 654 |
| | Council Solicitor & Democratic Services | 2,410 | 105 | | 2,515 |
| | Hsg / Council Tax Benefits Subsidy | 355 | | | 355 |
| | Capital Financing / Interest | 5,979 | | | 5,979 |
| | Unfunded Pensions | 1,634 | | | 1,634 |
| | Other Miscellaneous Budgets | 410 | | | 410 |
| | Magistrates | 22 | | | 22 |
| | Coroners | 312 | | | 312 |
| | Environment Agency | 199 | | | 199 |
| | Single Status | 60 | | | 60 |
| Revenue reserve repayments / Pensions Provision | 1,000 | | | 1,000 | |
| Inflation | 1,084 | | | 1,084 | |
| PORTFOLIO SUB TOTAL | 19,111 | 103 | | 19,215 | |

Portfolio Cash Limits 2009/10 - Revenue Budgets

Appendix 5 (ii)

| CABINET PORTFOLIO | Service | 2009/10 Revised Cashlimit - Mar'10 | Technical Adjustments, below BMS limits or already agreed shown for information | Total Virements For Approval | 2009/10 Revised Cashlimit - Mar'10 |
|------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 |
| Development & Major Projects | Major Projects Support | 648 | | | 648 |
| | Development & Regeneration | 1,319 | 100 | | 1,419 |
| | PORTFOLIO SUB TOTAL | 1,967 | 100 | | 2,067 |
| | NET BUDGET (EXCLUDES DSG) | 125,652 | (1,569) | | 124,082 |
| | Schools - Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) | 95,332 | | | 95,332 |
| | TOTAL BUDGET INCLUDING DSG | 220,984 | (1,569) | | 219,414 |

Sources of Funding (£)

| | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Council Tax | 74,858 | | 74,858 |
| Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) | 95,332 | | 95,332 |
| Revenue Support Grant | 7,500 | | 7,500 |
| Redistributed Business Rates (NNDR) | 32,493 | | 32,493 |
| Collection Fund Deficit (-) or Surplus (+) | 1,016 | | 1,016 |
| Balances | 1,736 | (1,935) | (199) |
| Area Based Grant | 7,493 | | 7,493 |
| Exceptional Risk Reserve | 556 | 366 | 922 |
| Total | 220,984 | (1,569) | 219,414 |

2010/2011 Revenue Virements for Approval

Appendix 5 (iii)

| REF NO | REASON/ EXPLANATION | CABINET MEMBER | TRANSFER FROM CASHLIM | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | CABINET MEMBER | TRANSFER TO CASHLIM | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | DESCRIPTION | ONGOING EFFECTS |
|--------|------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------|
|--------|------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------|

The following virements are reported for approval under the Budget Management Scheme rules.

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|----------|----------------|---|-------------------------------------|----------|----------------|--|-----------------------------|
| LOG 10#01 | Supported Lodgings | Children's Services [CW] | Children, Young People and Families | | 45,000 | Adult Social Services & Housing [VP] | Housing | | 45,000 | Transfer of management of Supported Lodgings between Portfolios. | Budget virement is ongoing. |
| LOG 10#02 | Young People's Substance Misuse | Resources [MH] | Policy & Partnerships | | 79,000 | Children's Services [CW] | Education - Learning & Inclusion | | 79,000 | Transfer between Portfolios of budget for Young People's Substance Misuse budget to align with spending responsibility. | Budget virement is ongoing. |
| OVERALL TOTALS | | | | 0 | 124,000 | 0 | | 0 | 124,000 | | |

2010/2011 Revenue Virements for Information

| REF NO | REASON/ EXPLANATION | CABINET MEMBER | TRANSFER FROM CASHLIM | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | CABINET MEMBER | TRANSFER TO CASHLIM | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | DESCRIPTION | ONGOING EFFECTS |
|--------|------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------|
|--------|------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------|

The following virements have either been previously approved, are technical in nature or are below limits within BMS that require approval, and therefore are reported for information only.

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--|---------------------------|---|--|--------|---------------------------|--|--|--------|--|-----------------------------|
| INFO 10#01 | Area Based Grant Correction | Resources [MH] | Policy & Partnerships | | 2,000 | Resources [MH] | Council Solicitor & Democratic Services | | 2,000 | Cash Limit Correction to Area Based Grant allocation for Community Call For Action O&S Committee | Budget virement is ongoing. |
| INFO 10#02 | Members Parking Permits | Customer Services [CG] | Car Parking (Excluding Park & Ride) | | 98,000 | Resources [MH] | Council Solicitor & Democratic Services | | 98,000 | Re-alignment of income and expenditure budgets for Members' parking permits reflecting higher charges. | Budget virement is ongoing. |
| INFO 10#03 | Finance Support Recharges | Resources [MH] | Corporate Estate (incl R&M) | | 45,000 | Resources [MH] | Finance | | 45,000 | Reduction in Finance recharge target due to re-allocation of work following finance restructure. | Budget virement is ongoing. |
| INFO 10#04 | Bath Festivals Strategy | Customer Services [CG] | Arts | | 22,000 | Customer Services [CG] | Tourism & Destination Management | | 22,000 | Bath Festivals strategy agreed budget transfer to Future Bath Tourism, Leisure & Culture 9th February 2010. | Budget virement is ongoing. |
| INFO 10#05 | Property & Facilities Savings Targets | Resources [MH] | Corporate Estate incl. R&M | | 23,763 | Resources [MH] | Commercial Estate | | 23,763 | Re-alignment of Property & Facilities savings targets that were incorrectly distributed in the Service Action Plan. | Budget virement is ongoing. |
| | | | Property Services | | 32,971 | | Traded Services | | 32,971 | | |

2010/2011 Revenue Virements for Information

| REF NO | REASON/ EXPLANATION | CASHLIM | | CASHLIM | | CASHLIM | | DESCRIPTION | ONGOING EFFECTS | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| | | CABINET MEMBER | TRANSFER FROM | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | CABINET MEMBER | TRANSFER TO | | | Income (£'s) |
| The following virements have either been previously approved, are technical in nature or are below limits within BMS that require approval, and therefore are reported for information only. | | | | | | | | | | |
| INFO 10#06 | Realignment of Management Budgets | Adult Social Services & Housing [VP] | Housing | 118,900 | 118,900 | Adult Social Services & Housing [VP] | Adult Services | 118,900 | Technical adjustment moving budget for service management within Portfolio. Budget virement is ongoing. | |
| INFO 10#07 | Change in profiling of PCT contribution to Pooled Budget | Resources [MH] | Council Balances | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | Adult Social Services & Housing [VP] | Adult Services | 2,000,000 | Due to its financial position at 2009/10 year end, the PCT is made an additional contribution to the pooled budget in 2009/10 with an equal offsetting reduction in the Council's contribution - this is the reverse side of that transaction. Budget virement is one-off | |
| INFO 10#08 | Development & Major Projects Cash Limit Realignment | Development & Major Projects [TG] | Major Projects Support | 46,977 | 46,977 | Development & Major Projects [TG] | Development & Regeneration | 46,977 | Re-alignment of cash limits following zero-cased budgeting review. Budget virement is ongoing. | |
| INFO 10#09 | Realignment of Management Budgets | Customer Services [CG] | Transport Design & Neighbourhood Services | 797,176 406,751 | 1,203,927 | Customer Services [CG] | Customer Services Overheads | 1,203,927 | Divisional Director overhead costs moved to Customer Services Strategic Director's Cash Limit. Budget virement is ongoing | |
| INFO 10#10 | Recovery Plan Staff Savings | Customer Services [CG] | Transport Design & Projects | 155,224 | 1,168,754 | Customer Services [CG] | Transport Design & Projects | Customer Services Overheads | 842,275 | Transfer of budgets for actual savings achieved across Service Cash Limits to offset savings targets budget. Budget virement is on-going |
| | | | Transportation Planning | 265,557 | | | | | | |
| | | | Planning Services | 642,914 | | | | | | |
| | | | Building Control & Land Charges | 105,059 | | | | | | |
| | | | Highways Network Maintenance | 238,062 | | | | | | |
| | | | Highways - Transport & Fleet Management | 33,656 | | | | | | |
| | | | Car Parking (Excluding Park & Ride) | 60,417 | | | | | | |
| | | | Waste | 89,124 | | | | | | |
| | | | Public Protection | 71,295 | | | | | | |
| | | | Neighbourhood Services | 349,721 | | | | | | |

2010/2011 Revenue Virements for Information

| REF NO | REASON/ EXPLANATION | CASHLIM | | CASHLIM | | CASHLIM | | TRANSFER TO | DESCRIPTION | ONGOING EFFECTS |
|--|--|------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|----------------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | | CABINET MEMBER | TRANSFER FROM | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | CABINET MEMBER | TRANSFER TO | | | |
| The following virements have either been previously approved, are technical in nature or are below limits within BMS that require approval, and therefore are reported for information only. | | | | | | | | | | |
| INFO 10#11 | Service Action Plan Savings | Customer Services [CG] | Planning Services Highways Network Maintenance Waste Public Protection | 86,585 50,000 250,000 46,635 | Customer Services [CG] | Transport Design & Projects Customer Services Overheads Neighbourhood Services | 7,243 357,977 68,000 | | Transfer of budgets for actual savings achieved or not achieved across Service Cash Limits to offset savings targets budget. | Budget virement is on-going |
| INFO 10#12 | Staff Awards Budget | Resources [MH] | Chief Executive | 5,000 | Resources [MH] | Performance Development | 5,000 | | Combining the Staff Awards held by Chair's Office with Employee Excellence Awards budget, as approved by Divisional Director of Improvement & Performance. | Budget virement is on-going |
| INFO 10#13 | Workplaces & Offices Rationalisation | Resources [MH] | Balances | 276,767 | Resources [MH] | Property Services Risk & Assurance Services | 217,634 59,133 | | Temporary drawdown from reserves to cover initial costs of Workplaces Rationalisation Project, to be repaid to reserves in 2011/12 & 2012/13, as reported in December 2009 Workplaces & Office Rationalisation Cabinet Report. | Budget virement is one off. |
| INFO 10#14 | Area Based Grant (Accounting Adjustment) | Resources [MH] | Area Based Grant | 253,269 | Children's Services [CW] | Children, Young People & Families Learning Inclusion | 12,796 240,473 | | Allocation of additional Area Based Grant | Budget virement ongoing although adjustments to future years' cash limits will be required to reflect changes in grants. |
| INFO 10#15 | Portaloo Scheme | Resources [MH] | One Off Headroom | 30,000 | Resources [MH] | Policy & Partnerships | 30,000 | | Drawdown from unused One-Off Headroom budget to continue use of Portaloo's in Orange Grove, as approved by Leader & Deputy Leader. | Budget virement is one-off |
| INFO 10#16 | Corporate Estate Budget Realignment | Resources [MH] | Property Services | 461,573 | Resources [MH] | Corporate Estate (incl. R&M) | 461,573 | | Realignment of Corporate Estate budgets into correct cash limit. | Budget virement is ongoing. |

2010/2011 Revenue Virements for Information

| REF NO | REASON/ EXPLANATION | CABINET MEMBER | TRANSFER FROM CASH/LIM | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | CABINET MEMBER | TRANSFER TO CASH/LIM | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | DESCRIPTION | ONGOING EFFECTS |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| <p>The following virements have either been previously approved, are technical in nature or are below limits within BMS that require approval, and therefore are reported for information only.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| INFO 10#17 | Public Protection & Neighbourhood Services Base Budget Corrections | Customer Services [CG] | Customer Service Overheads | | 76,439 | Customer Services [CG] | Public Protection | | 33,642 | Realignement of Public Protection & Neighbourhood Services budget from Customer Services Overheads budget. | Budget virement is ongoing. |
| | | | | | | | Risk & Assurance Services | | 42,797 | | |
| INFO 10#18 | DSG Contribution to Joint Agency Pooling Agreement | Children's Services [CW] | Children, Young People & Families | | 400,000 | Children's Services [CW] | Education - Learning & Inclusion | | 400,000 | Amount agreed by the Schools Forum to increase the education contribution to the Joint Agency Pooling (JAP) arrangement for the 2010/11 Budget. This pooled budget pulls together contributions from Social Care, Education and PCT to provide care for children in care with complex needs. | Budget virement is ongoing. |
| INFO 10#19 | Movement of Commissioning Admin Budget | Adult Social Services & Housing [VP] | Housing | | 6,921 | Adult Social Services & Housing [VP] | Adult Services | | 6,921 | Transfer of Admin Team Costs from Housing to Services Delivery cash limit. | Budget virement is ongoing. |
| OVERALL TOTALS | | | | 0 | 7,547,776 | 0 | 7,547,776 | 0 | 7,547,776 | | |

Portfolio Cash Limits 2010/11 - Revenue Budgets

Appendix 5 (iv)

| CABINET PORTFOLIO | Service | 2010/11 Cashlimits - Feb'10 Budget | Technical Adjustments, below BMS limits or already agreed - shown for information | Total Virements For Approval | 2010/11 Revised Cashlimit - Jul'10 |
|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 |
| Customer Services | Transport Design & Projects | (152) | 224 | | 72 |
| | Transportation Planning (including Public Transport) | 5,591 | (266) | | 5,326 |
| | Park & Ride | (1,037) | | | (1,037) |
| | Planning Services | 3,736 | (729) | | 3,006 |
| | Building Control & Land Charges | 100 | (105) | | (5) |
| | Highways - Network Maintenance | 7,491 | (288) | | 7,203 |
| | Highways - Transport & Fleet Management | (86) | (34) | | (119) |
| | Customer Service - Overheads | (155) | 2,328 | | 2,173 |
| | Car Parking (excluding Park & Ride) | (6,193) | (158) | | (6,352) |
| | Waste | 11,081 | (339) | | 10,742 |
| | Public Protection | 1,261 | (84) | | 1,176 |
| | Neighbourhood Services | 5,799 | (646) | | 5,153 |
| | Libraries & Information | 2,512 | | | 2,512 |
| | Arts | 633 | (22) | | 611 |
| | Tourism & Destination Management | 1,156 | 22 | | 1,178 |
| | Heritage including Archives | (3,374) | | | (3,374) |
| Sports & Active Leisure | 924 | | | 924 | |
| PORTFOLIO SUB TOTAL | 29,288 | (98) | | 29,190 | |
| | Children, Young People & Families | 13,012 | (387) | (45) | 12,579 |
| | Learning Inclusion | 2,196 | 640 | 79 | 2,915 |
| | Children's Services Strategic Planning | (104,733) | | | (104,733) |
| | Schools Budget | 114,279 | | | 114,279 |
| PORTFOLIO SUB TOTAL | 24,753 | 253 | 34 | 25,040 | |
| Adult Social Services and Housing | Adult Services | 45,412 | 2,126 | | 47,538 |
| | Housing | 6,469 | (126) | 45 | 6,388 |
| | Community Learning | 127 | | | 127 |
| | Drug Action Team | 598 | | | 598 |
| | Employment Development | 234 | | | 234 |
| PORTFOLIO SUB TOTAL | 52,840 | 2,000 | 45 | 54,885 | |
| Resources | Finance | 1,337 | 45 | | 1,382 |
| | Support Services Change Programme | 252 | | | 252 |
| | Customer Access | 1,903 | | | 1,903 |
| | Revenues & Benefits | 1,107 | | | 1,107 |
| | Transformation Service | 766 | | | 766 |
| | Council's Retained ICT Budgets | (1,069) | | | (1,069) |
| | Risk & Assurance | 1,085 | 59 | | 1,144 |
| | Property Services | 1,236 | (277) | | 959 |
| | Corporate Estate Including R&M | 6,730 | 393 | | 7,123 |
| | Commercial Estate | (12,690) | 24 | | (12,666) |
| | Traded Services | 28 | 33 | | 61 |
| | Policy & Partnerships | 2,356 | 28 | (79) | 2,305 |
| | Performance Development | 861 | 5 | | 866 |
| | Human Resources | 966 | | | 966 |
| | Chief Executive | 449 | (5) | | 444 |
| | Communications & Marketing | 551 | | | 551 |
| | Council Solicitor & Democratic Services | 2,308 | 100 | | 2,408 |
| | Hsg / Council Tax Benefits Subsidy | 355 | | | 355 |
| | Capital Financing / Interest | 6,084 | | | 6,084 |
| | Unfunded Pensions | 1,709 | | | 1,709 |
| | Other Miscellaneous Budgets | 1,752 | | | 1,752 |
| | Magistrates | 22 | | | 22 |
| | Coroners | 351 | | | 351 |
| | Environment Agency | 205 | | | 205 |
| | Pensions Provision | 2,082 | | | 2,082 |
| | One-off Headroom | 83 | (30) | | 53 |
| Inflation | 331 | | | 331 | |
| PORTFOLIO SUB TOTAL | 21,147 | 375 | (79) | 21,443 | |

Portfolio Cash Limits 2010/11 - Revenue Budgets

Appendix 5 (iv)

| CABINET PORTFOLIO | Service | 2010/11 Cashlimits - Feb'10 Budget | Technical Adjustments, below BMS limits or already agreed - shown for information | Total Virements For Approval | 2010/11 Revised Cashlimit - Jul'10 |
|-------------------|---|------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 |
| | Major Projects Support | 599 | (47) | | 552 |
| | Development & Regeneration | 1,313 | 47 | | 1,360 |
| | PORTFOLIO SUB TOTAL | 1,912 | | | 1,912 |
| | NET BUDGET (EXCLUDES DSG) | 129,940 | 2,530 | | 132,470 |
| | Schools - Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) | 98,898 | | | 98,898 |
| | TOTAL BUDGET INCLUDING DSG | 228,838 | 2,530 | | 231,368 |

Sources of Funding (£'000)

| | | | |
|--|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Council Tax | 76,777 | | 76,777 |
| Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) | 98,898 | | 98,898 |
| Revenue Support Grant | 5,270 | | 5,270 |
| Redistributed Business Rates (NNDR) | 36,289 | | 36,289 |
| Collection Fund Deficit (-) or Surplus (+) | 846 | | 846 |
| Balances / Exceptional Risk Reserve | (264) | 2,277 | 2,013 |
| Area Based Grant | 11,022 | 253 | 11,276 |
| Total | 228,838 | 2,530 | 231,368 |

Capital Outturn by Portfolio 2009/10

| Overall Summary | Actual | Budget | Variance | Requested Rephasing (Under) | Requested Rephasing Over | (Under spend) |
|--|----------|----------|----------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| | £' 000's | £' 000's | £' 000's | £' 000's | £' 000's | £' 000's |
| Total Customer Services | 14,484 | 18,396 | (3,912) | (2,245) | 73 | (1,740) |
| Total Children Services | 28,013 | 32,950 | (4,937) | (4,216) | 1,484 | (2,205) |
| Total Adult Social Services & Housing | 3,050 | 3,186 | (136) | (95) | 2 | (43) |
| Total Resources & Support Services | 2,923 | 3,527 | (604) | (555) | 281 | (330) |
| Total Development & Major Projects (excl CDSM) | 803 | 1,176 | (373) | (373) | 0 | 0 |
| Total Corporate Budgets | 2,547 | 2,620 | (73) | (361) | 397 | (109) |
| Sub Total | 107,315 | 61,855 | (10,035) | (7,845) | 2,237 | (4,427) |
| CDSM | 22,092 | 24,820 | (2,728) | (2,421) | 0 | (307) |
| Total Schemes | 129,407 | 86,675 | (12,763) | (10,266) | 2,237 | (4,734) |
| Contingency | 0 | 6,215 | (6,215) | (6,215) | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 73,909 | 92,889 | (18,978) | (16,481) | 2,237 | (4,734) |

This page is intentionally left blank

Detailed Capital Variance and Rephasing Requests

| Capital Outturn Position - 2009/10 | Total Outturn Variance (underspend) / Overspend | Rephasing Requests (Unders) | Rephasing Requests (Overs) | (Under spend) / Over spend |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 |
| Customer Services | | | | |
| Highways Structural Maintenance Block | -113 | -111 | | -2 |
| s.31 DfT Grant Schemes re Structural Maintenance | 61 | | 61 | |
| Transport Improvement Programme | 2 | | | 2 |
| Bath Package - bid costs | -431 | -431 | | |
| Bath Package - main scheme costs | -579 | | | -579 |
| Bath Package - property costs | -137 | -137 | | |
| Greater Bristol Bus Network | -908 | | | -908 |
| CIVITAS (Strategic Transport) | -3 | -3 | | |
| Play Equipment | -66 | | | -66 |
| Allotments | -23 | | | -23 |
| Waste Efficiency Schemes (DEFRA Grant Funded) | -196 | | | |
| Disposal Containers | | -9 | | |
| Route Planning Software | | -50 | | |
| Weighbridge Replacement | | -30 | | |
| Automatic Number Plate Recognition Cameras | | | | -95 |
| Grant Currently Unallocated | | | | -12 |
| Bus Lane CCTV Cameras ANPR | -77 | -30 | | -47 |
| Vehicle Replacement - Waste | -914 | -914 | | |
| Vehicle Replacement - Neighbourhoods | -530 | -530 | | |
| Vehicle Replacement - Passenger Transport | 12 | | 12 | |
| Central Bath Toilet Facilities Grant | -10 | | | -10 |
| Total Customer Services | -3,912 | -2,245 | 73 | -1,740 |
| Children's Services | | | | |
| Projects - delivered by D&MP/property | | | | |
| Play pathfinder | -155 | -155 | | |
| Children's Centres | -821 | -821 | | |
| Children's Centre Improvements | -9 | -9 | | |
| Writhlington (BSF) | 279 | | 279 | |
| St Keyna | -33 | -33 | | |
| Fosseway | -221 | -221 | | |
| Writhlington Applied Learning Centre | -229 | -229 | | |
| Wellsway Sports Hall | -226 | -226 | | |
| Primary Capital programme | -1,433 | -1,433 | | |
| Projects - not delivered by D&MP | | | | |
| Writhlington Co Location | -50 | -50 | | |
| EY Extended Services | 171 | | | 171 |
| Children's Services - Extended Services | -246 | -75 | | -171 |
| EY Small Capital Claims | -49 | -49 | | |
| EY IT Packages for Settings | -45 | -45 | | |
| Repairs and Maintenance | 139 | | 139 | |
| 14-19 Diplomas - LA Spend | 183 | | | 183 |
| Hayesfield Receipts - LA Spend | 1 | | | 1 |
| Aiming High for Disabled Children | 3 | | 3 | |
| Funding Streams - underspends to be reflected in italics in 2010/11 | | | | |
| Seed Challenge | -97 | | | -97 |
| NDS Modernisation Budget | -317 | | | -317 |
| Specialist Schools Capital | -100 | | | -100 |
| School Travel Plans | -5 | | | -5 |
| Primary Capital programme - unallocated | -286 | | | -286 |
| Schools Access Initiatives | -349 | | | -349 |
| Schools Capital Programmes | -183 | | | -183 |
| Harnessing Technology - LA spend | -3 | | | -3 |
| Devolved Formula Capital | 983 | | 983 | |
| Spend at School Level (exc Devolved Capital) | -768 | | | -768 |
| 14-19 Diplomas | -281 | | | -281 |
| Pending reconciliation | | | | |
| Medium Schemes | 70 | | 70 | |
| Small Schemes | -833 | -833 | | |
| C&F Minor Works | -28 | -28 | | |
| ICS grant | 10 | | 10 | |
| ICT Grant for mobile technology | -9 | -9 | | |
| Total Children's Services | -4,937 | -4,216 | 1,484 | -2,205 |

| Capital Outturn Position - 2009/10 | Total Outturn Variance (underspend) / Overspend | Rephasing Requests (Unders) | Rephasing Requests (Overs) | (Under spend) / Over spend |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 |
| Adult Social Services & Housing | | | | |
| Information Management | -1 | | | -1 |
| Disabled Facility Grant | 79 | | | 79 |
| Remedial Repairs | -298 | -6 | | -292 |
| Community Safety | -9 | | | -9 |
| Energy Efficiency | 200 | | | 200 |
| Care & Repair | 6 | | | 6 |
| Wessex Loan Subsidy | 12 | | | 12 |
| Places for Change | 4 | | | 4 |
| Fuel Poverty Assistance | -78 | -78 | | |
| Social Housing Programme | -42 | | | -42 |
| CRC - Major Projects Capital Schemes | -11 | -11 | | |
| Carrswood Terrace | 7 | | 2 | 5 |
| Minor Works/H&S/Access | -5 | | | -5 |
| Total Adult Social Services & Housing | -136 | -95 | 2 | -43 |

| Resources & Support Services | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Non Property | | | | |
| Building Safer Communities | -4 | | | -4 |
| Government Connect Project | -28 | -28 | | |
| Critical Application Upgrade | -33 | -33 | | |
| IT Infrastructure Upgrade Projects | -208 | -208 | | |
| IT Management Systems | -255 | -255 | | |
| Modern Gov Implementation | -26 | -26 | | |
| Transformation - EDRMS | -61 | | | -61 |
| Transformation - Work from Anywhere | -67 | | | -67 |
| Guildhall One Stop Shop | -4 | | | -4 |
| Sub Total - Non Property | -686 | -550 | 0 | -136 |
| Property | | | | |
| Corporate Estate Capital | -36 | -5 | | -31 |
| Commercial Estate Development Fund | -23 | | | -23 |
| Property Development Work | -142 | | | -142 |
| Great Drain Works | 2 | | | 2 |
| Estates Capital | 281 | | 281 | |
| Sub Total - Property | 82 | -5 | 281 | -194 |
| Total Resources & Support Services | -604 | -555 | 281 | -330 |

| D&MP | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|----------|-------------|
| Combe Down Stone Mines - Eligible - EP | -2,411 | -2,411 | | |
| Combe Down Stone Mines Foxhill - Eligible - MoD | -10 | -10 | | |
| Combe Down Stone Mines - Ineligible | -307 | | | -307 |
| Southgate (non recoverable - Banes) | -91 | -91 | | |
| Southgate (Recoverable from Multi) | -31 | -31 | | |
| Public Realm - Wayfinding | -227 | -227 | | |
| Spa | -24 | -24 | | |
| Total D&MP | -3,101 | -2,794 | 0 | -307 |
| externally funded | -649 | -342 | 0 | -307 |

| Corporate | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Offices Project | | | | |
| Keynsham & Regeneration | -361 | -361 | | |
| Programme Office | 39 | | 39 | |
| Change Management (new ways of working) | 136 | | 136 | |
| The Hollies | 15 | | 15 | |
| Lewis House | 207 | | 207 | |
| Sub Total - Property | 36 | -361 | 397 | 0 |
| BWR | -109 | | | -109 |
| Sub Total - BWR | -109 | 0 | | -109 |
| Total Corporate | -73 | -361 | 397 | -109 |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Total | -12,763 | -10,266 | 2,237 | -4,734 |
| Contingency | -6,215 | -6,215 | | |

2010/11 Capital Programme Approvals

Changes to Budget

| Funding Source | 2010/11 | 2011/12 | 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | Total |
|--|---------------|--------------|--------------|----------|------------------|---------------|
| | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | onwards £'000 | |
| Project Approvals | | | | | | |
| BWR - Project Team Costs | 994 | | | | | 994 |
| BWR - Affordable Housing Contribution | 1,419 | 1,343 | 1,023 | | 3,122 | 6,907 |
| BWR - Infrastructure Contribution | 2,700 | 2,800 | | | | 5,500 |
| Beechen Cliff - Astro Turf Pitch | 500 | | | | | 500 |
| Bluecoat House | 144 | | | | | 144 |
| Public Realm - Preparatory Projects | 687 | | | | | 687 |
| Public Realm - Union St/Stall St | 1,589 | | | | | 1,589 |
| Disabled Facilities Grant | 1,000 | | | | | 1,000 |
| Private Sector Renewal | 689 | | | | | 689 |
| Kitchen Waste Containers | 321 | | | | | 321 |
| Waste Efficiency Initiatives | 89 | | | | | 89 |
| Youth Capital | 81 | | | | | 81 |
| Gasdown St John Early Years Element | 49 | | | | | 49 |
| Chew Stoke Primary Classroom Extension | 140 | | | | | 140 |
| Total | 10,402 | 4,143 | 1,023 | 0 | 3,122 | 18,690 |

Changes in Funding

| Funding Approvals | 2010/11 | 2011/12 | 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | Total |
|---|---------------|--------------|--------------|----------|------------------|---------------|
| | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | onwards £'000 | |
| Government Grant | 2,196 | 2,337 | | | | 4,533 |
| Service Supported Borrowing | 1,519 | 1,343 | 723 | | 2,322 | 5,907 |
| Unsupported Borrowing | 0 | | | | | 0 |
| Capital Receipts inc RTB receipts | 2,420 | 463 | 300 | | 800 | 3,983 |
| Third Party Contributions inc 106 Revenue Contribution | 689 | | | | | 689 |
| Total | 10,402 | 4,143 | 1,023 | 0 | 3,122 | 18,690 |

This page is intentionally left blank

Capital Programme by Portfolio - 2009/10

| CAPITAL SCHEME | 2009-10 | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | Current Budget at 3rd March | Additions to Programme to Outturn inc Technical Adjustments | Final Budget at Outturn |
| | £000 | £000 | £000 |
| CUSTOMER SERVICES | | | |
| Highways Maintenance | 3,055 | | 3,055 |
| Integrated Transport Block | 2,863 | | 2,863 |
| Bath Package Construction | 661 | | 661 |
| Bath Package Bid Costs | 2,668 | | 2,668 |
| Bath Package Property | 70 | 137 | 207 |
| GBBN Construction | 2,758 | | 2,758 |
| Garden Waste Tipping Bays | 45 | | 45 |
| Allotments | 26 | | 26 |
| Play Area Equipment | 230 | | 230 |
| Haycombe Cemetery Scheme | 0 | | 0 |
| Central Bath Toilet Facilities Grant | 10 | | 10 |
| Roman Baths Site Development | 1,949 | 80 | 2,029 |
| Bath Spring Water Strategy | 0 | | 0 |
| Grant to Holborne Museum | 200 | | 200 |
| Broadmead Lane | 2 | | 2 |
| ANPR Bus Lane Enforcement Upgrade | 340 | | 340 |
| ANPR Bus for recycling centres | 45 | | 45 |
| Recycling Containers | 151 | | 151 |
| Weighbridge for Midland Road | 30 | | 30 |
| Route Planning Software for Refuse Collection Vehicles | 50 | | 50 |
| 2 x Bulk Waste Containers | 15 | | 15 |
| Clocking on/Off Technology | 6 | | 6 |
| CIVITAS | 306 | | 306 |
| A4 Twerton Rehabilitation Works - s31 grants | 436 | | 436 |
| A4 De trunking - Station Road - s31 grants | 109 | | 109 |
| RVP New Interpretation Centre | 183 | | 183 |
| Neighbourhood Vehicle Replacement | 984 | | 984 |
| Waste Vehicle Replacement | 914 | | 914 |
| Highways TAMP - Drainage Survey - s31 grants | 73 | | 73 |
| | 18,179 | 217 | 18,396 |

| CAPITAL SCHEME | 2009-10 | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | Current Budget at 3rd March | Additions to Programme to Outturn inc Technical Adjustments | Final Budget at Outturn |
| | £000 | £000 | £000 |
| CHILDREN'S SERVICES | | | |
| BSF Writhlington School (Grant) | 16,776 | | 16,776 |
| St Keyna | 189 | | 189 |
| Fosseway Special Refurbishment (Grant) | 497 | | 497 |
| Threeways | (120) | | (120) |
| Schools' Capital Maintenance Programme | 525 | | 525 |
| Primary Capital Programme - Batheaston | 435 | 20 | 455 |
| Primary Capital Programme - WASPS | 380 | | 380 |
| Primary Capital Programme - MSN | 771 | | 771 |
| Primary Capital Programme - Bathford | 480 | | 480 |
| Primary Capital Programme - Unallocated | 286 | | 286 |
| Integrated Childrens System | (8) | | (8) |
| Play Pathfinder | 1,279 | 5 | 1,285 |
| 14-19 Diplomas Programme | 145 | | 145 |
| Writhlington Applied Learning Centre | 550 | | 550 |
| Ralph Allen ALC | 0 | | 0 |
| Wellsway Sports Hall | 980 | (580) | 400 |
| Capital Contribution to College Diplomas | 0 | | 0 |
| Harnessing Technology Grant | 387 | | 387 |
| Children's Trust Co-Location - Writhlington | 50 | | 50 |
| Specialist Schools Grant | 175 | | 175 |
| Chew Valley Construction | 250 | | 250 |
| Children's Centres | 261 | 246 | 507 |
| Children's Centre Improvements | 0 | | 0 |
| Early Years/IT Packages for Settings | 200 | | 200 |
| Early Years - Small Capital Claims | 55 | | 55 |
| Early Years - Access & Quality | 200 | | 200 |
| Early Years Extended Services (Westfield Childrens Centre) | 80 | | 80 |
| Welton Pre School Contribution | 0 | | 0 |
| Early Years - Children's Centres Grant - funding Stream | 944 | | 944 |
| Early Years - General Sure start Grant | 200 | | 200 |
| Extended Schools Services | 385 | | 385 |
| Spend at School Level - DFC non VA schools | 2,152 | | 2,152 |
| Spend at School level - Travel plans | 93 | | 93 |
| Spend at School level - Harnessing Technology | 95 | | 95 |
| Spend at School level - Seed Challenge | 201 | | 201 |
| Spend at School level - Private Capital | 463 | | 463 |
| Spend at School level - E Learning Credits | 30 | | 30 |
| Aiming High for Disabled Children | 60 | | 60 |
| Schools Access Initiative - funding stream | 351 | | 351 |
| Schools Modernisation | 1,701 | | 1,701 |
| Schools Basic Need / New Pupil Places | (0) | | (0) |
| Southside Regeneration | 0 | | 0 |
| Wellsway Music Block | 20 | | 20 |
| Childrens Care Services | 11 | | 11 |
| St John's Development | 1,314 | | 1,314 |
| C&F minor works | 28 | | 28 |
| Medium Schemes | 27 | | 27 |
| Small Schemes | 335 | | 335 |
| Culverhay Changing Room | 0 | 25 | 25 |
| | 33,233 | (284) | 32,950 |

| CAPITAL SCHEME | 2009-10 | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | Current Budget at 3rd March | Additions to Programme to Outturn inc Technical Adjustments | Final Budget at Outturn |
| | £000 | £000 | £000 |
| ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES & HOUSING | | | |
| Home Adaption Grants | 40 | | 40 |
| Minor Works - H&S | 67 | | 67 |
| Disabled Facilities Grant | 1,019 | | 1,019 |
| Discretionary Grants - Private Sector Renewal (DFG over 25k) | 20 | | 20 |
| Discretionary Grants - Private Sector Renewal (Remedial Repairs) | 405 | | 405 |
| Discretionary Grants - Private Sector Renewal (Community Safety) | 105 | | 105 |
| Discretionary Grants - Private Sector Renewal (Energy Efficiency) | 72 | | 72 |
| Freedom From Fuel Poverty | 181 | | 181 |
| Social Housing Grant | 1,241 | | 1,241 |
| Community Resource Centres | 27 | | 27 |
| IT Infrastructure - Software Purchase | | 9 | 9 |
| | 3,177 | 9 | 3,186 |
| RESOURCES & SUPPORT SERVICES | | | |
| Building Safer Communities | 54 | | 54 |
| Corporate Estate Planned Maintenance | 832 | | 832 |
| Risk assessment/disabled access | 525 | | 525 |
| Property Development Work | 142 | 561 | 703 |
| Commercial estate development | 400 | | 400 |
| Transformation - EDRMS | 219 | | 219 |
| Transformation - Flexible Workspace | 109 | | 109 |
| Guildhall One Stop Shop | 3 | | 3 |
| Fire Precautions in HMO's | (0) | | (0) |
| Great Drain Works | 48 | | 48 |
| Property Services - Estates Capital | (481) | | (481) |
| Agresso Main System Update | 0 | | 0 |
| Capitalised IT Refresh | 554 | | 554 |
| Server & IT Refresh | 0 | 493 | 493 |
| Sales Value enhancements | 0 | 66 | 66 |
| | 2,405 | 1,120 | 3,525 |
| DEVELOPMENT & MAJOR PROJECTS | | | |
| Stone Mines (Banes) | 361 | | 361 |
| Stone Mines (HCA) | 19,686 | | 19,686 |
| Stone Mines Foxhill | 4,713 | 60 | 4,773 |
| Southgate (Multi) | 255 | | 255 |
| Southgate (FP) | 170 | | 170 |
| Spa | 19 | | 19 |
| Development & Regeneration | 459 | (459) | 0 |
| Public Realm - Wayfinding | 731 | | 731 |
| | 26,395 | (399) | 25,996 |
| CORPORATE | | | |
| Avon Coroners Capital Grant | 469 | | 469 |
| Bath Western Riverside - West | 652 | | 652 |
| Replacement Council Offices | 745 | | 745 |
| Lewis House Refurbishment - Short Term | 13 | | 13 |
| Replacement Council Offices-Medium Term | 101 | | 101 |
| Office Rationalisation - Children's Services Pilot | 589 | 51 | 640 |
| | 2,569 | 51 | 2,620 |
| TOTAL excl CONTINGENCY | 85,959 | 714 | 86,673 |
| Contingency | 6,352 | (137) | 6,215 |
| TOTAL | 92,311 | 577 | 92,889 |

| Sources of Funding (£'000) | | | |
|--|---------------|------------|---------------|
| Government - Supported Borrowing | 6,053 | | 6,053 |
| Government Grant | 49,893 | (300) | 49,593 |
| Capital Receipts (inc RTB and Scheme Specific) | 3,397 | 627 | 4,024 |
| Unsupported Borrowing (inc Inter Year Funding Adjustments) | 29,708 | (459) | 29,249 |
| Service Supported Borrowing | 1,637 | | 1,637 |
| Revenue Contribution | 554 | 544 | 1,098 |
| 3rd Party (inc s106) | 1,069 | 165 | 1,234 |
| Total | 92,311 | 577 | 92,889 |

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 9 (ii)

Capital Programme by Portfolio - 2010/11

| CAPITAL SCHEME | 2010/11 | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Feb'10 Council Approved Budgets | Additions to Programme to 15th July | Budget at 15th July Cabinet |
| | £000 | £000 | £000 |
| Customer Services | | | |
| Planning & Transport | | | |
| Local Transport Improvement Schemes | 1,480 | | 1,480 |
| Two Tunnels | | 269 | 269 |
| 5 Arches | | 631 | 631 |
| CIVITAS schemes | 558 | | 558 |
| GBBN Construction | 1,398 | | 1,398 |
| Bath Package Bid costs post PE | | 1,200 | 1,200 |
| Bath Package Construction | 300 | | 300 |
| Bath Package Scheme Property | | 410 | 410 |
| Bath Package Excess Property | | | 0 |
| Green Bus | 127 | | 127 |
| Corporate GIS | | | 0 |
| | 3,863 | 2,510 | 6,372 |
| Environmental Services | | | |
| Highways | | | |
| Highways Maintenance | 3,467 | | 3,467 |
| Highways Maintenance - top up | 2,000 | | 2,000 |
| A4 Hicks Gate to Twerton Fork | 436 | | 436 |
| Passenger Transport | | | |
| Passenger Transport Fleet Replacement | 956 | | 956 |
| Waste | | | |
| Vehicle Replacements - Waste | 1,870 | | 1,870 |
| Neighbourhoods | | | |
| Allotments | 208 | | 208 |
| | 8,937 | 0 | 8,937 |
| Tourism Leisure & Culture | | | |
| Roman Baths Site Development | 301 | | 301 |
| Roman Baths Site Development - catering | 469 | | 469 |
| Bath Spring Water Strategy | 164 | | 164 |
| | 934 | 0 | 934 |
| | 13,734 | 2,510 | 16,243 |
| Childrens Services | | | |
| Spend at school level - DFC non VA schools | 3,300 | | 3,300 |
| BSF Writhlington School | 525 | | 525 |
| Fosseway School | 57 | | 57 |
| Schools Capital Maintenance Programme | 600 | | 600 |
| Batheaston PCP | 1,165 | | 1,165 |
| WASPS PCP | 2,615 | | 2,615 |
| Midsomer Norton PCP | 1,340 | | 1,340 |
| Bathford PCP | 500 | | 500 |
| Writhlington Applied Learning Centre | 2,950 | | 2,950 |
| Aiming High for Disabled Children | 140 | | 140 |
| Play Pathfinder | 230 | | 230 |
| Children's Centres | 664 | 127 | 791 |
| Children's Centre Improvement | 57 | | 57 |
| Early Years small capital claims | | 34 | 34 |
| Early Years Access & Quality | | 200 | 200 |
| Spend at school level - Harnessing Technology | 800 | | 800 |
| Writhlington - Childrens Trust Co-location project | 429 | | 429 |
| Wellsway Sports Hall | 2,180 | 120 | 2,300 |
| | 17,552 | 481 | 18,033 |

| CAPITAL SCHEME | 2010/11 | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Feb'10 Council Approved Budgets | Additions to Programme to 15th July | Budget at 15th July Cabinet |
| | £000 | £000 | £000 |
| Adult Care & Health Commissioning | | | |
| Social Housing Grant | 1,368 | | 1,368 |
| | 1,368 | 0 | 1,368 |
| Support Services | | | |
| Property & Facilities | | | |
| Corporate Estate Planned Maintenance | | 976 | 976 |
| Risk Assessment/Disabled Access (DDA) | | 538 | 538 |
| Support Services - non-Property | | | |
| Agresso update (5.5) | | 144 | 144 |
| | 0 | 1,658 | 1,658 |
| Development & Major Projects | | | |
| Combe Down Stone Mines (HCA) | 6,000 | | 6,000 |
| Combe Down Stone Mines (Council) | 526 | | 526 |
| Combe Down Stone Mines - Foxhill | | | 0 |
| Southgate (Multi) | 255 | | 255 |
| Southgate (Council) | 170 | | 170 |
| Public Realm - Wayfinding | 969 | | 969 |
| | 7,920 | 0 | 7,920 |
| Corporate | | | |
| Replacement Council Offices | | | |
| Short Term - including Lewis House Refurbishment | 2,996 | | 2,996 |
| Medium Term Replacement Council Offices | 2,971 | | 2,971 |
| Other Corporate | | | |
| Contingency | 1,000 | (410) | 591 |
| | 6,967 | (410) | 6,558 |
| TOTAL | 47,541 | 4,239 | 51,780 |

Sources of Funding (£'000)

| | | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| Government Supported Borrowing | 3,467 | | 3,467 |
| EU/Government Grant | 18,020 | 1,376 | 19,396 |
| Capital Receipts (inc RTB) | 300 | 1,421 | 1,721 |
| Revenue | 0 | | 0 |
| Service Supported Borrowing | 12,135 | 1,437 | 13,572 |
| Unsupported Borrowing (inc Inter Yr Adjustments) | 12,148 | 0 | 12,148 |
| s106 Contribution | 116 | | 116 |
| Other 3rd Party | 1,355 | 5 | 1,360 |
| Total | 47,541 | 4,239 | 51,780 |

Capital Virements - Additions & Reductions 2009/10

Appendix 10 (i)

| REF NO | REASON / EXPLANATION | TRANSFER/FUNDING FROM | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | TRANSFER TO | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | Notes |
|-----------------------|---|--|-------------------|-------------------|---|-------------------|--------------------|---|
| CAP09#47 - 2009 | Development & Regeneration | Unsupported Borrowing | | 459,000 | | 459,000 | | Development & Regeneration funded by Unsupported Borrowing |
| CAP09#48 - 2009 | Play Pathfinder | 3rd Party Contribution | 5,100 | | Children's Services: 3rd Party Contributions | | 5,100 | Skate park contribution funded by Manic Skaterz |
| CAP09#49 - 2009 | Culverhay Changing Rooms | Government Grant | 25,000 | | Children's Services: Government Grant | | 25,000 | School project funded by 14-19 grant |
| CAP09#50 - 2009 | Wellsley Sports Hall | Various | | 580,000 | Children's Services: Various | 580,000 | | Wellsley Sports Hall funded by capital receipts, grant & school contributions |
| CAP09#51 - 2009 | Carefirst Workflow Module | Government Grant | 9,000 | | Adult Services: Government Grant | | 9,000 | Care First Workflow Module funded by IT Infrastructure Grant |
| CAP09#52 - 2009 | Primary Capital Programme - Batheaston | 3rd Party Contribution | 20,000 | | Children's Services: 3rd Party Contribution | | 20,000 | POP funded by Hayestiled playing field receipt |
| CAP09#53 - 2009 | Charlton Road Development - Capital Costs | Capital Receipts | 561,284 | | Property Services: Capital Receipts | | 561,284 | Capital costs of Charlton road deal funded by sale proceeds |
| CAP09#54 - 2009 | Children's Centres | Government Grant | 246,250 | | Children's Services: Government Grant | | 246,250 | Children's Centres funded by extended services grant |
| CAP09#55 - 2009 | Roman Baths Development | 3rd Party Contribution | 80,000 | | Tourism Leisure & Culture: Third Party Contribution | | 80,000 | £80k contribution from Wolfson Grant |
| CAP09#56 - 2009 | Property - Capitalisation of Sales Value Enhancements | Capital Receipts | 65,873 | | Property Services: Capital Receipts | | 65,873 | Capitalisation of sales value enhancements funded by capital receipts |
| CAP09#57 - 2009 | Riverside Offices Pilot | Service Supported Borrowing / Revenue Contribution | 50,874 | | Property Services & Children's Services: SSB / Revenue Contribution | | 50,874 | Increased scope of project funded by revenue |
| CAP09#58 - 2009 | Combe down stone mines - Foxhill | Government Grant | 60,000 | | Development & Major projects: Government Grant | | 60,000 | Final costs funded by government grant |
| CAP09#59 - 2009 | Capitalised IT Refresh | Revenue Contribution | 492,908 | | Resources & Support Services: Revenue Contribution | | 492,908 | Capitalisation at year end |
| OVERALL TOTALS | | | 38,499,424 | 24,729,766 | | 24,729,766 | 38,499,424 | |
| | | | | 13,769,658 | | | -13,769,658 | |

| REF NO | REASON / EXPLANATION | TRANSFER/FUNDING FROM | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | TRANSFER TO | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | Notes |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|---|
| Capital Virements - Additions & Reductions 2010/11 - 2013/14 | | | | | | | | |
| REF NO | REASON / EXPLANATION | TRANSFER/FUNDING FROM | Income | Expenditure | TRANSFER TO | Income | Expenditure | Notes |
| FUT09#24 - 2010 | CIVITAS | Government Grant | | 41,873 | Customer Services: Civitas | 41,873 | | CIVITAS Grant |
| FUT09#25 - 2011 | CIVITAS | Government Grant | | 121,033 | Customer Services: Civitas | 121,033 | | CIVITAS Grant |
| FUT09#26 - 2012 | CIVITAS | Government Grant | | 60,442 | Customer Services: Civitas | 60,442 | | CIVITAS Grant |
| FUT09#27 - 2010 | Aiming High for Disabled Children | Government Grant | 140,000 | | Children's Services: Government Grant | | 140,000 | AHDC Capital funded by Government Grant |
| OVERALL TOTALS | | | 17,822,218 | 2,518,485 | | 2,518,485 | 17,822,218 | |
| | | | | 15,303,733 | | | -15,303,733 | |

Capital Virements - Additions & Reductions 2010/11

Appendix 10 (ii)

| REF NO | REASON / EXPLANATION | TRANSFER/FUNDING FROM | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | TRANSFER TO | Income (£'s) | Expenditure (£'s) | Notes |
|-----------------------|---|--|------------------|-------------------|--|--------------|-------------------|--|
| CAP10#01 - 2010 | Corporate Estate Planned Maintenance | Capital Receipts / Service Supported Borrowing | 976,000 | | Property Services - Corporate Estate Planned Maintenance | | 976,000 | Approved in March Cabinet |
| CAP10#02 - 2010 | Risk Assessment/Disabled Acces (DDA) | Capital Receipts | 538,000 | | Property Services - DDA | | 538,000 | Approved in March Cabinet |
| CAP10#03 - 2010 | Bath Transport Package - Public Inquiry | Service Supported Borrowing | 1,200,000 | | Customer Services - BTP | | 1,200,000 | Approved in March Cabinet |
| CAP10#04 - 2010 | Wellsway Sports Hall | Government Grant | 100,000 | | Children's Services: Wellsway Sports Hall from 14-19 grant | | 100,000 | Approved by Technical Adjustment |
| CAP10#05 - 2010 | Early Years Quality & Access | Government Grant | 200,000 | | Children's Services - Early Years | | 200,000 | Approved by Technical Adjustment |
| CAP10#06 - 2010 | Children's Centres | Government Grant | 127,276 | | Children's Services - Children's Centres | | 127,276 | Approved by Technical Adjustment |
| CAP10#07 - 2010 | Early Years Small Capital Claims | Government Grant | 33,942 | | Children's Services - Early Years | | 33,942 | Approved by Technical Adjustment |
| CAP10#08 - 2010 | Agresso 5.5 System Upgrade | Service Supported Borrowing | 144,000 | | Support Services - Agresso 5.5 | | 144,000 | Approved by SMD 2062 |
| CAP10#09 - 2010 | Five Arches | Government Grant and Third Party Contributions | 631,000 | | Customer Services - Five Arches | | 631,000 | Approved in March Cabinet |
| CAP10#10 - 2010 | Two Tunnels | Government Grant | 269,000 | | Customer Services - Two Tunnels | | 269,000 | Approved by delegated Officer Decision E1842 |
| CAP10#11 - 2010 | Wellsway Sports Hall | 3rd Party Contribution & School Contribution | 20,000 | | Children's Services: Wellsway Sports Hall from Hayesfield receipt & School Contributions | | 20,000 | Approved by Technical Adjustment |
| OVERALL TOTALS | | | 4,239,218 | 4,239,218 | | 0 | 4,239,218 | |
| | | | | | | 0 | -4,239,218 | |

Capital Virements - Additions & Reductions 2011/12 - 2014/15

| REF NO | REASON / EXPLANATION | TRANSFER/FUNDING FROM | Income | Expenditure | TRANSFER TO | Income | Expenditure | Notes |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| FUT10#01 - 2011 | Agresso 5.5 System Upgrade | Service Supported Borrowing | 44,000 | | Support Services - Agresso 5.5 | | 44,000 | Approved by SMD 2062 |
| FUT10#02 - 2011 | Five Arches | Government Grant and Third Party Contributions | 631,000 | | Customer Services - Five Arches | | 631,000 | Approved in March Cabinet |
| FUT10#03 - 2011 | Writhlington (BSF) | Government Grant | | 750,000 | | 750,000 | | Approved by Technical Adjustment |
| OVERALL TOTALS | | | 675,000 | 750,000 | | 750,000 | 675,000 | |
| | | | | -75,000 | | | 75,000 | |