



# Executive Decision Report

<b>Decision maker(s) at each authority and date of Cabinet meeting, Cabinet Member meeting or (in the case of individual Cabinet Member decisions) the earliest date the decision will be taken</b>	Full Cabinet decision  Date of decision: 3 November 2014	
	Full Cabinet  30 October 2014  04280/14/K/AB	
<b>Report title (decision subject)</b>	<b>ESTABLISHMENT OF A BI-BOROUGH ALTERNATIVE PROVISION HUB SCHOOL</b>	
<b>Reporting of</b>	<b>Cabinet Member for Children and Education – Councillor Sue Macmillan</b>	
<b>Reporting officer</b>	Ian Heggs, Tri-borough Director of Schools	
<b>Key decision</b>	Yes	
<b>Access to information classification</b>	<b>Open Report</b>	

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report summarises the current alternative provision for children not in mainstream education in Kensington and Chelsea and also in Hammersmith & Fulham, and makes proposals for its development in order to raise standards of delivery and improve pupil outcomes.
- 1.2 The Tri-borough Director of Children’s Services in Kensington and Chelsea, who chairs the Bi-Borough Hub School Programme Board, is of the view that the continued success of the high-performing Tri-Borough Alternative Provision (TBAP) services will be significantly enhanced by the creation of a new or refurbished Bi-Borough Hub School reflecting the criteria set out in this report.
- 1.3 This approach has been endorsed by the Bi-Borough Hub School Programme Board, which has confirmed its recommendation for the Bi-Borough Hub School

to be established on the site of the current Bridge Academy in Hammersmith and Fulham, funded by a combination of proceeds from the alternative use of the current RBKC Latimer Education Centre site, where the Latimer Alternative Provision Academy is currently based and it is hoped, a successful capital bid to the Education Funding Agency, led by the TBAP Trust. It would have particular benefit to the current Latimer Centre pupils in raising standards and expectations, as The Latimer Centre is currently classified by Ofsted as 'Good', as opposed to The Bridge's 'Outstanding' judgement. The Latimer Centre would be used as a decant facility until the current Bridge Academy site, including the Greswell Centre site currently used by Action on Disability (formerly HAFAD), is appropriately refurbished and remodelled.

- 1.4 In essence, both authorities would be making significant contributions to ensure the effectiveness of this scheme. To supplement the current Bridge Academy site, LBHF would be making available to the Hub School the Greswell Centre (Action on Disability) site, and RBKC would be contributing a sum equivalent to a valuation of the current Latimer site.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 Cabinet is recommended to agree that:

- The principle of a Bi-Borough Hub School be adopted;
- The recommended site option is the Bridge Academy site in Hammersmith and Fulham (**Option 2 in section 6.2**)
- The site currently occupied by Action on Disability (formerly HAFAD) adjacent to the Bridge Academy is included within the Bi-Borough Hub School site,
- 3BM, through its existing contract with LBHF, be commissioned to produce a more detailed, costed programme for the works, developing the design for the new Bi-Borough Hub School sufficiently to give sufficient cost certainty, establishing the decant implications and checking existing proposals against the planning brief prepared for the site under BSF. This would be undertaken at risk by LBHF subject to a limit of £20,000;
- A further report be produced at the conclusion of RIBA Stage 3;
- Consultation begins at the appropriate time with key stakeholders;

subject to:

- Agreement by Cabinet in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea to make a capital contribution of £6.2m to fund the additional facilities required for its resident pupils
- Any additional capital costs for the scheme being met by the Education Funding Agency, following a bid from the TBAP Trust for AP Academies Capital.

### **3. REASONS FOR DECISION**

3.1 Cabinet approval is requested because:

- The scheme is of a high value;
- It requires substantial capital funding to create the Bi-Borough Hub School on a single site. It requires the physical relocation of all alternative provision principally supporting RBKC students at the Latimer Alternative Provision Academy currently located within RBKC to LBHF;
- It requires The Bridge Academy in LBHF to deliver education to Latimer students on its site, and the building to be remodelled accordingly.
- Failure to approve may result in the TBAP Trust seeking a 125 year lease of both existing sites, as is their right by law as set out in the Academies Act, thus removing the ability of either Council to deal effectively and efficiently with property assets where they retain the freehold or use them to invest in improved alternative provision for the benefit of vulnerable pupils.

### **4. BACKGROUND**

- 4.1 The TBAP Multi-Academy Trust is a highly effective, overarching organisation established to oversee the delivery of alternative education provision across the tri-borough area. It supports pupils experiencing difficulty in maintaining mainstream school placements, chiefly those who have been excluded from school. Robust academy trust and governance arrangements are now in place. In looking to support the Trust in one of its current key aspirations, the establishment of a Bi-Borough Hub School, the intention is to maximise the opportunity to drive up and maintain high standards, as well as expanding the curriculum offer.
- 4.2 Tri-Borough Alternative Provision was brought together through a partnership led by the Executive Headteacher of the Bridge AP Academy in Hammersmith and Fulham, who is himself designated a National Leader of Education. The Bridge is a highly successful AP Academy rated by Ofsted as “Outstanding in all areas” in its last inspection. The other three AP Academies within the TBAP Trust are currently judged as ‘Good’.
- 4.3 Such provision is inherently difficult to offer to such a level of quality, partly because the vast majority of students referred to alternative provision are highly vulnerable and are often in the midst of or working their way through significant trauma or personal or family difficulties. As a result their behaviour can reflect their troubled condition and impede learning and socialisation quite considerably
- 4.4 The skill sets, experience and training of staff required to implement such approaches are not universal, nor are the leadership qualities required of those responsible for such provision evident in all educational leaders. Furthermore, as

compared with other educational provisions, unit sizes are often small, making broad, balanced curriculum delivery by specialists disproportionately problematic. As difficult to achieve within the resources available in small establishments is the wide variety of relationships necessary with employers, further and higher educational establishments and schools in order to facilitate appropriate, personalised onward routes for students.

- 4.5 TBAP staff are recognised experts at delivering outstanding outcomes with some of our most challenging young people. Pupils have often been excluded from school and present with extreme behaviours. All pupils have some kind of additional need, and some have very complex social, emotional or educational needs. Pupils can be both verbally and physically challenging on entry but make remarkable progress over time at TBAP Academies. The proportion of pupils who receive the pupil premium is well above average. Two TBAP Academies achieved runner-up status in the National Pupil Premium Awards and attended an awards ceremony hosted by the Deputy Prime Minister in recognition of outstanding work in reducing the achievement gap of their most vulnerable pupils.

## **5. PROPOSAL AND ISSUES**

### **5.1 Quality of Provision**

TBAP Academies work with a range of other local providers to offer the support most appropriate to each individual student. The success of the Bridge AP Academy provision is reflected in LBHF by:

- The demonstrable reduction in those Not in Education or Employment (“NEET”);
- The reduction in statements and referrals for support for behaviour;
- The reduced need for other SEN provision related to such needs.

- 5.2 One of the biggest single indicators of successful outcomes is arguably that related to NEETs. The national NEET figure is 6.7% overall. In LBHF, the host of the highly effective Bridge Academy, the position is better than that nationally, at 4.6% (a 13.4% reduction over 4 years), whereas in RBKC the situation is much less favourable at 7.3%. The importance of reducing NEETS cannot be underestimated: some 15% of long term NEETs are dead within 10 years of leaving school. Appendix A summarises research into the costs of NEETS and cost-effective preventative strategies. The service overall would benefit from greater links with and access to the excellence displayed in LBHF.

- 5.3 The creation of a high quality, enlarged Bi-Borough Hub School would create an environment much more able to support the raising of achievement and opportunities consistently across the tri-borough area.

### **5.4 Provision made in AP Academies**

The four borough-based AP Academies: Latimer (RBKC), The Bridge Academy (LBHF), the Courtyard Primary AP Academy (LBHF) and Beachcroft (WCC), - offer a range of provision for some of the most vulnerable students educated within the boundaries of the tri-borough partnership. The on-site, full-time education for students who have been excluded from mainstream school, are hard to place for a variety of reasons or who have other behavioural, emotional or social difficulties is complemented by such work as part-time placements supporting placements elsewhere, brokering of work-related learning and support for schools and teachers in behaviour management both generally and in specific circumstances. Curricula are broad and balanced and aim to prepare students for reintegration into mainstream life, be it in school, college, work or further training. The TBAP website ([www.tbap.org.uk](http://www.tbap.org.uk)) provides a comprehensive analysis of the services available collectively and in each LA. Commissioned places reflect the requirements of each LA, although the provision is clearly used flexibly to meet the needs of individual children most appropriately.

5.5 Whereas the AP Academies themselves offer direct provision to students, they will frequently commission other providers (FE colleges, work-related learning, voluntary organisations and some of those listed in paragraph 5.8 below) to supplement the offer made. In 2012 some 30 such places were commissioned.

5.6 **Non Hub-based provision ('Spokes') – Commissioning and School Support**  
Commissioning and School Support provide interventions in tri-borough schools and smaller centres to support the inclusion of learners in schools whose behaviour is causing concern and preventing them achieving. Unless stated, there are no proposals to significantly alter the provision and facilities for the spoke element of the TBAP service.

5.7 Each authority has a range of such provision within it. A summary is provided below:

LA/Provision Name	Type	Age Range	No. Planned Places	Current
<b>LBHF</b>				
Bridge Academy	AP with range of ancillary services	11-16	180 in all	116
Childerley Centre	Day 6 of exclusion provision and managed intervention	11-16	Matched to purchasing.	13*
Courtyard	Primary AP with ancillary services	5-11	16	16
Pupil Inclusion Development Service	In-school support and interventions: mainly LBHF	5-11	2FTE Teachers; 4 Development	34*
<b>RBKC</b>				
Behaviour Intervention Team	Range of in-school interventions/ CPD	5-11	3FTE Teachers	64*
Golborne Education	Day 6 of exclusion provision and managed	11-16	Matched to purchasing.	8*

Centre	intervention			
Latimer Education Centre	AP with range of ancillary services	11-16	44	27
Portobello Centre	Vulnerable pupils and those not in school	11-16	12	08
<b>WCC</b>				
Beachcroft School	AP offer includes Day 6 of exclusion provision and managed intervention; developing primary support	5-16	50 on-site; 20 in related provision	39

\*Number recorded in 1 specific week.

### 5.8 **Academy Status**

All existing PRUs have become AP Academies as part of the Tri-borough Multi-Academy Trust (MAT). Academy conversion has little impact on LA or Dedicated Schools Grant finances (see below). A more direct impact, however, arises from LAs having no liability for repairs and maintenance of Academies (although place costs are always likely to have a relevant cost element included).

5.9 TBAP is submitting an application to set up an AP Academic 6<sup>th</sup> Form Free School. This school will target academically able pupils in AP who do not achieve their potential GCSE grades. These pupils will join the free school AP Academy and complete A-levels to facilitate progression to good universities. TBAP propose co-location of this post-16 provision with the bi-borough hub school and would anticipate appropriate levels of capital funding to be made available from the DfE's Free School programme. These proposals are entirely commensurate with the development plans for the provision and, if agreed, would be incorporated into the whole site planning process.

### 5.10 **TBAP: A Major Training Provider**

From 2013, TBAP, working in partnership with Goldsmiths University of London, has begun to take a leading role in coordinating teacher training. TBAP hosts a number of School Direct places in Maths and English. This new path into teaching enables participants to gain the qualifications and practical skills they need to become teachers and supports teachers within as well as outside of the Tri-Borough Partnership.

5.11 TBAP also offers a range of other professional development opportunities, many of them focused on staff within the tri-borough partnership, thus helping to drive up the quality of work within mainstream, AP and special schools and improving pupil outcomes.

5.12 In April 2014 The Bridge Academy was designated as a national Teaching School. Teaching Schools take a leading role in recruiting and training new entrants to the profession, identifying leadership potential and providing support for other schools. The Bridge AP Academy was one of only 200 "outstanding"

schools in England to be granted this status in the latest designation round. The TBAP Teaching School Alliance (TBAP TSA) will train new teachers in behaviour management and early intervention. In 2015-16 the TBAP TSA expects to train upwards of 25 new teachers. These teachers will then be expertly equipped to deliver outstanding education in our schools. More closely aligning PRU students with this excellence will inevitably improve outcomes.

#### 5.13 **Pupil Place Planning**

It is unlikely that student numbers at the Bridge AP Academy in Hammersmith and Fulham will alter significantly in the coming 3-5 years: whilst funding changes might appear likely to lead to a reduction in places purchased by schools, conversely, perceived need has increased in recent years and is likely to counterbalance that effect. Indeed, recently there has been a marked increase in requests from schools in all three boroughs for managed moves, as well as an increase in requests for KS3 placements.

- 5.14 However, the need to broaden the service available to support Royal Borough students will lead to an increase in planned places at the Latimer AP Academy, and an increase over current take-up of some 25 students. A significant element of the increase will result from an enhanced purchased service bought by schools. Furthermore, both LBHF and RBKC services need to be mindful of the likely impact of new housing programmes such as that at Earls Court; although the detailed effect of these initiatives cannot yet be quantified it may be important to future-proof current service proposals. However, there is a critical size beyond which such hub provisions cease to become efficient and effective, and it is the view of the service that the proposed hub should not increase its on-site cohort beyond 150, using the benefit of its tri-borough partnership, as at present, to help to manage numbers and young people's needs.

#### 5.15 **Interagency Engagement**

Critical to the lives of many of the troubled young people who are supported in Alternative Provision are agencies such as Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS), other health-related services, Youth and Youth Offending services and social care support. These services are characteristically challenged in respect of their own resourcing, and inevitably target it where it will have the greatest benefit. The larger size of the Bridge Academy has clearly contributed towards its success, as recognised by Ofsted, in attracting support from these agencies, as has a well-developed collaborative ethos. Co-location of these services will lead to faster and more effective early intervention and support for families.

- 5.16 A Bi-Borough AP Hub School would thus be likely not only to increase the impact of these agencies through further economies of scale; but also share the excellent multi-agency practice currently demonstrable at the Bridge with a wider group of students, further improving their life-chances.

### 5.17 **Cost and Benefits: Financial**

Pupil funding essentially follows the child and is reflected in planned places, so the location and impact of restructuring of the provision does not necessarily affect budgets other than the DSG, specifically the High Needs Block. However, there is clearly a cost benefit achievable by rationalising sites, and, even if an LA does not directly benefit from that saving, its community will almost certainly benefit from improvements to the service made (see below) and schools will be able to re-use the savings to make further improvements to this or other areas of service. Cash savings that are almost certain to be made will relate to a diminishing need to purchase other, more expensive provision if higher quality, broader-based provision is offered locally. It should also be noted that easing pressure on the High Needs Block of the DSG will reduce the likelihood of the Authority needing to support any expenditure arising from additional needs arising, for example, from implementing the Children and Families Act.

5.18 It is feasible that, through a Bi-Borough Hub School, administrative, site and management costs might reduce over time by in the region of £100,000 per annum in the following areas:

- The size of the administrative function;
- Site cleaning and routine repairs and maintenance;
- The cost of rates in respect of the site released;
- Loss of liability for ongoing backlog maintenance in respect of that site would also ultimately constitute a service saving. Long-term maintenance and improvement of the site released would cease to apply and, in respect of the chosen site, would no longer be an LA liability.

### 5.19 **Cost and Benefits: Wider Economic and Societal**

A tangible benefit of improved provision to very vulnerable students is their re-inclusion into mainstream life and their on-going engagement with society through further education and employment. Student-focused PRUs support this re-inclusion, and the University of York (see Appendix A) has attempted to quantify the benefits of such inclusion, in terms not only of reductions in claims for benefits and other costs; but also in broader costs to society.

5.20 Sharing the Bridge experience on one site, providing students with an improved and broader curriculum with more individualised support is sure to diminish the likelihood of students becoming NEET. Equally, the economies of scale offered by a larger provision will inevitably further improve the range and scope of the curriculum available, increasing opportunities for personalisation. (The summary of key research findings shown at Appendix B has previously been referenced.)

### 5.21 **Geographical Locations**

The geographical home locations of the students attending the Bridge and Latimer respectively are available and do not favour one location over the other.



## 6. OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS

### 6.1 Supporting Improvement in Alternative Provision

Discussion and debate in recent years has led to the conclusion that there are three main options:

- (i) To relocate the Bridge provision to the Latimer site and create a Bi-Borough Hub School on that site.
- (ii) To relocate the Latimer provision to the Bridge and current Greswell St sites, to develop a Bi-Borough Hub School in Hammersmith and Fulham, refurbishing to 21<sup>st</sup> century standards.
- (iii) To remain in existing facilities and seek to drive up quality through existing partnership arrangements.

6.2 The issues related to the three location options are indicated below. Children's Services officers are of the view that if the Bridge site is selected then full refurbishment should be undertaken in order to deliver accommodation which is fully fit for purpose given the age and nature of the existing building. It is envisaged, subject to a full range of design and site considerations as yet not fully assessed, that the new provision might be occupied by 2018.

#### **Option 1: Bi-Borough Hub School on the Latimer Site in RBKC**

The Bridge provision would relocate to the Latimer site to create a Bi-Borough Hub School at the Latimer. The Bridge and HAFAD sites would be sold or used for other purposes and the estimated proceeds of £12.5m if sold used to contribute towards development costs.

The scheme would comprise a new build extension on the site, refurbishment of the existing buildings, new build infill and refurbishment of the outbuildings on site. The proposals would produce on-site provision for a 150 pupil PRU with a maximum capacity of 164 pupil places at a project cost of £17.3m excluding site value. The cost per pupil rate for such a scheme would be £105,000.

The receipt would not fully cover the scheme costs so H&F and RBKC would need to contribute a further £3.6m and £1.2m respectively.

This option is not recommended by the two Property Departments as the site disadvantages considerably outweigh the advantages. Furthermore, the project costs of the scheme to each Borough exceed the costs associated with the options considered for the Bi-Borough Hub School at the Bridge in the option below.

#### **Option 2: Bi-Borough Hub School on the Bridge Academy Site in LBHF (Recommended)**

The Latimer provision would be relocated to the Bridge Academy site to create a Bi-Borough Hub School in Fulham with a potential capacity of 150 on-site places, including both new build and full refurbishment incorporating the Greswell St site

at a cost of £8.6m. This option produces a cost per pupil rate of £48,000. The Royal Borough's contribution would be to the level of £6.2 million, reflecting the market value of the Latimer site, which would have an alternative use once it is vacated. No decision has been taken about what this alternative use might be at this stage. As £6.2m would not fully cover the costs, the TBAP Trust has confirmed that it will make a bid to the EFA for additional capital resources to fund the budget gap from the AP Academies Capital pot. Informal discussion with the EFA has already begun about this and initial feedback has been positive.

### Option 3:-Status Quo

The maximum capacity of the Latimer building is 50 pupils. It is clear, however, that the existing condition and configuration of the property could hinder the TBAP'S efforts to improve the provision further. Doing nothing at the Latimer is thus not considered a viable option. Equally, it would be appropriate to upgrade the Bridge facility anyway in order to meet 21<sup>st</sup> century educational requirements.

### Summary of Benefits and Disadvantages of each Option:

Option	Benefits	Disadvantages
(i) Bi-Borough Hub School on Latimer Site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enables curriculum, leadership and management skills to be shared;</li> <li>• Economies of scale achievable and broadening of the curriculum through a larger quantum;</li> <li>• The more centrally located site;</li> <li>• Good transport routes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires Westway to confirm long term Recreation and Apprenticeship proposals;</li> <li>• Smaller onsite recreation space and complex ownership;</li> <li>• High capital costs and onerous planning and conservation conditions;</li> <li>• Fewer subsequent opportunities to expand provision should that be required in the future.</li> </ul>
(ii) Bi-Borough Hub School on Bridge Site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enables sharing of curriculum, leadership and management skills;</li> <li>• Larger economies of scale and more broadening of the curriculum;</li> <li>• Larger site, enabling more on-site provision and future expansion opportunities;</li> <li>• Few planning constraints and risks;</li> <li>• Lower capital costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location less central;</li> <li>• Good transport links by bus, but no tube link nearby</li> </ul>
(iii) Maintain status quo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few capital costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raising standards more difficult as lines of communication weaker;</li> <li>• Lack of economies of scale;</li> <li>• Broader curriculum through increase in quantum not feasible.</li> </ul>

### 6.3 Specification and Site Issues

A service specification for this new Bi-Borough Provision was prepared by collaboration between Children's Services, Corporate Property and TBAP staff and further developed by Surface to Air Architects. It indicates the outputs that any new or refurbished building would need to deliver.

6.4 There is a risk that if it proves impossible to reach agreement within a reasonable timeframe, the TBAP Multi-Academy Trust will seek 125 year leases of the Latimer and Bridge sites, thus depriving the local authority of the ability to facilitate a new centre in a single location and maximise the financial benefits of its property assets. It is noted that both H&F and RBKC have granted short leases of 7 years 6 months, with provision of break clauses, for The Bridge and the Latimer to the Academy Trust. This has been agreed with the Trust and DfE to provide maximum flexibility for the local authority when the Bi-Borough solution has been identified and agreed. However the Academy Trust is entitled to a 125 year lease on both sites, and the DfE could invoke powers under the Academy Act 2010 to require the local authority to transfer the sites to the TBAP Trust. This would disrupt the local authority's ability to strategically manage its assets or maximise the value of them.

6.5 3BM are reviewing the feasibility study undertaken to scope possible works and providing a report appraising it, taking into account the LBHF planning brief which was developed during the BSF process. Other key items which 3BM are reviewing are as follows:

- Project budget: review of outline project budget against the proposed accommodation schedule. Calculation of target cost per square meter to establish target costings per building elements.
- Phasing and decant analysis
- Planning appraisal and review of historic planning briefs
- Architectural Review
- Programme.

3BM will be convening a project review to understand next steps and clarification of key items and client engagement.

6.6 Action on Disability's (AoD) most recent lease of the Greswell Centre from the Council expired on 31 March 2008, since when it has been holding over under a Tenancy at Will. The Greswell Centre was declared surplus by LBHF's Cabinet on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2011, subject to an alternative location being found. The Council does not charge AoD rent. In order to free up the Greswell Centre for its planned disposal, it had been agreed to relocate AoD functions to the Lyric Community Hub (for its youth services provision), with the remainder of the service relocating elsewhere in the borough. AoD is favourably disposed towards these moves and work is continuing with them to confirm both a permanent site and the timeline for their move.

6.7 The loss of a capital receipt from the withdrawal of the Greswell Centre from the Disposals Programme has been noted in the latest update of H & F's Capital Programme Monitor.

## 7. CONSULTATION

- 7.1 Significant consultation will be required with current and, where known, future users of Alternative Provision and their families in, where relevant, all 3 boroughs (because of interdependencies of provision); with schools, and with neighbours and communities in both areas. A communications plan will be prepared and implemented, incorporating regular updates for interested parties.
- 7.2 Ward Members for the most affected areas in RBKC and LBHF will be consulted at the earliest opportunity in accordance with the democratic protocols of each borough.

## 8. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1. An initial equality impact assessment has been drawn up and is attached as Appendix B. A full equality impact assessment will be completed before a final decision on this proposal is taken.

## 9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The legal implications are contained within the report. It should be noted that the two Alternative Provision Academies would be entitled to seek 125 year leases on the existing sites should they so wish.

(Legal comments added by David Walker, Principal Solicitor  
[david.walker@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:david.walker@rbkc.gov.uk), 020 7361 2211)

## 10. FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

### 10.1 Revenue

Revenue costs of TBAP Academies are essentially met from a block grant of £8,000 per planned place passported through the EFA, topped up by the High Needs Block and supplemented by the purchasing individual packages in many cases by schools. A summary is provided below of 2014-5 commissioning plans for the 4 key AP Academies, showing the top-ups routinely applied to placements via DSG

Centre	EFA SEN Places	EFA Funding Per Pupil	HNB Top-up	EFA AP Places	EFA AP Fund	DSG Top-up	Other Govt Income (eg PP)	Income Generation	Total Income
Beachcroft	10	£10k	£25k	65	£8k	£11.7k	£12.2k	£12.2k	£1,773k
Bridge	30	£10k	£25k	150	£8k	£9k	£27k	£277.5k	£3,901k
Courtyard	8	£10k	£25k	8	£8k	£21.5k	£0	£0	£528k
Latimer/Portobello	15	£10k	£25k	50	£8k	£10k*	£13.7k	£0	£1,689k

## 10.2 Capital

Option	Project Cost Estimate (£000)	Comments
Option (i): Bi Borough PRU at the Latimer site	17,300*	Includes new build extension and major refurbishment.
Option (ii): Bi-Borough PRU at the Bridge site	8,600*	Includes major refurbishment and some new build.
Option (iii): Status Quo:	**	Inevitably some refurbishment would be required.

\*Excludes decanting costs- to be quantified alongside design development.

\*\*It is difficult to foresee no investment being made in these tired buildings; but this has not been costed to date as this is not considered to be a realistic option.

The proposal is to establish the bi-borough PRU at the Bridge Academy site and is estimated to cost £8.6m. It is proposed that RBKC make a contribution of £6.2 m, equivalent to the estimated market value of the Latimer site.

The £6.2m RBKC contribution could be supplemented and the full sum required achieved if the EFA were to support a successful bid for additional resources.

- 10.3 Pupil funding essentially follows the child and is reflected in planned places, so the location and impact of restructuring of the provision do not necessarily affect budgets other than the DSG, which is not a centrally-held LA budget. However, there is clearly a cost benefit from rationalising sites, including likely reductions in both management and administration costs and a degree of routine maintenance.
- 10.4 Even if an LA does not directly benefit from that saving, its community will almost certainly benefit from improvements to the service made and schools will be able to re-use the savings to make further improvements to this or other areas of service. Furthermore, the placement charges are in part funded by a top-up from the High Needs Block, a characteristically constrained budget, and this top-up could be re-negotiated in the light of known savings. Anticipated revenue reductions have been referred to in paragraph 5.19 above.

Ian Heggs  
**Tri-Borough Director of Schools**

Cleared by Finance (officer's initials)	DMc
Cleared by Legal (officer's initials)	DW

**Contact officer:** Ian Turner Education Capital Projects Manager

077 393 14756

### **The Cost of NEETs: Some Summary Research Findings**

#### **1. Direct Costs of those NEET Between Ages 16 and 18**

- Estimated as £56,000 per person in public finance (benefits etc);
- Some £104,000 in lost labour market potential;
- NEETs cost £22m per week in Jobseekers' Allowance;
- NEETs also cost £23m as a consequence of their youth crime, in individual cases the cost to the taxpayer of drifting into persistent and serious offending being in excess of £2m each;
- Overall, between £12bn and £32bn in direct costs and £22-77bn in losses to the economy and the individual.

#### **2. Wider Health and Welfare Costs to Individuals and Society**

- Young male NEETs are 3 times more likely to suffer depression and 5 times more likely to have a criminal record;
- Young women who significantly underachieve (many of whom are NEET) are 15 times more likely to suffer depression at age 42 and 44% more likely to have a child by age 19;
- Young people who have underachieved are 75% more likely to be smokers by the age of 30;
- NEETs become bored and isolated, and have an increased likelihood of long-term unemployment, ill-health and, if eventually employed, being engaged in low-paid jobs.

#### **3. Effective Approaches Cited**

- £4,000 spent on short-term support to a young mother can generate £80,000 in tax contributions and reduce lifetime public service costs by £200,000;
- “Relatively inexpensive” youth support projects produce major public finance savings;
- One of the best strategies involves targeted pre-16 support for those at risk.

#### Sources:

University of York Social Policy Research;

Audit Commission (used these findings and developed them);

Work Foundation and Private Equity Foundation (used York's findings).

## Equality Impact Analysis

Overall Information	Details of Full Equality Impact Analysis
Financial Year and Quarter	2015 – 2018
Name and details of policy, strategy, function, project, activity, or programme	Title of EIA: Establishment of Bi-Borough Alternative Provision (AP) Hub School Short summary: In implementing the Tri-Borough AP Strategy, establishing a Hub School on the Bridge site accommodating both LBHF and RBKC AP pupils <b>Note</b>
Lead Officers	Name: Ian Heggs Position: Director of Schools Commissioning Email: <a href="mailto:Ian.Heggs@rbks.gov.uk">Ian.Heggs@rbks.gov.uk</a>  Ian Turner Education Capital Projects Manager Ian.Turner@rbkc.gov.uk 077 393 14756
Lead Borough	State which officer is co-ordinating the EIA and other associated documentation  Ian Turner
Date of completion of final Full EIA	9/010//2014

Section 02	Scoping of Full EIA						
Plan for completion	Timing: December 2014 Resources: Within existing Children's Services and Corporate Property Projects Resources.						
Analyse the impact of the policy, strategy, function, project, activity, or programme	Analyse the impact of the policy on the protected characteristics (including where people / groups may appear in more than one protected characteristic). You should use this to determine whether the policy will have a positive, neutral or negative impact on equality, giving due regard to relevance and proportionality.						
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Protected characteristic</th> <th>Borough Analysis</th> <th>Impact:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Protected characteristic	Borough Analysis	Impact:			
Protected characteristic	Borough Analysis	Impact:					



Age	<b>RBKC and LBHF</b> This change in itself will have no impact on the age of those to admitted or supported.	Neutral
Disability	<b>RBKC and LBHF</b> Whilst the temporary relocation of Bridge pupils to Latimer Road and the final relocation of all to the Bridge site may impact on travelling times to a small degree (the centres are a short distance apart) and for some create a longer journey (but for others a shorter one), the new facilities to be provided at the Bridge will be fully compliant with Equalities Act requirements and offer significantly better and broader opportunities to young people for whom such opportunities are critical to their future education, employment and well being..	Neutral
Gender reassignment	<b>RBKC and LBHF</b> The proposal will have no known impact	Neutral
Marriage and Civil Partnership	<b>RBKC and LBHF</b> The proposal will have no known impact	Neutral
Pregnancy and maternity	<b>RBKC and LBHF</b> The proposal will have no known impact except potentially to improve provision for school-age mothers	Neutral
Race	<b>RBKC and LBHF</b> The proposal will have no known impact except to improve provision for the educationally disadvantaged	Neutral
Religion/belief (including non-belief)	<b>RBKC and LBHF</b> The proposal will have no known impact	Neutral
Sex	<b>RBKC and LBHF</b> The proposal will have no known impact	Neutral
Sexual Orientation	<b>RBKC and LBHF</b> The proposal will have no known impact	Neutral

**Human Rights or Children's Rights**

If your decision has the potential to affect Human Rights or Children's Rights, please contact your Borough Lead for

advice  
No reason to assume so

<b>Section 03</b>	<b>Analysis of relevant data</b> Examples of data can range from census data to customer satisfaction surveys. Data should involve specialist data and information and where possible, be disaggregated by different equality strands.
<b>Documents and data reviewed</b>	
<b>New research</b>	No new research is required. The University of York research referred to in the main body of the report illustrates the importance of reducing NEETs and addressing access to opportunities issues faced by vulnerable young people, issues addressed by the report's recommendations.

<b>Section 04</b>	<b>Consultation</b>
	Complete this section if you have decided to supplement existing data by carrying out additional consultation.
<b>Consultation in each borough</b>	The Governing Bodies of both Academies have been informally consulted, as have staff and both LAs' Cabinet Members.
<b>Analysis of consultation outcomes for each borough</b>	The outcomes of the consultations were in favour of the proposals.

<b>Section 05</b>	<b>Analysis of impact and outcomes</b>
<b>Analysis</b>	The impact on all but those with disabilities will be positive as the proposal will improve young people's access to a broad and individualised range of educational programmes. The final provision will be more suitable for those with disabilities and more able to accommodate more and more efficient visits by specialist support agencies. The locations are a short journey apart, minimising travel issues for the vulnerable.

<b>Section 06</b>	<b>Reducing any adverse impacts and recommendations</b>
<b>Outcome of Analysis</b>	The design of the new build and refurbishment of the existing building at The Bridge will be fully compliant with the latest Equalities Act requirements. A travel plan will assist in advising on support required in travelling to the new site, especially for RBKC pupils, and for LBHF pupils temporarily travelling to the Latimer site.

<b>Section 07</b>	<b>Action Plan</b>
<b>Action Plan</b>	Note: You will only need to use this section if you have identified actions as a result of your analysis  Produce a travel plan for both eventualities.

<b>Section 08</b>	
<b>Chief Officers' sign-off</b>	Name: Andrew Christie Position: Director of Family and Children's Services Email: Andrew.Christie@rbkc.gov.uk
<b>Key Decision Report (if relevant)</b>	Date of report to Cabinet: 3/11/2014 (LBHF) Has been agreed in principle by Cabinet Members (09/10/2014 RBKC: 10/10 LBHF) Key equalities issues have been included: Yes
<b>Lead Equality Manager (where involved)</b>	Name: Position: Date advice / guidance given: Email: Telephone No: