

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD

Head of Finance and Governance Services

Contact: Graham Thrussell on 01243 534653

Email: gthrussell@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House

1 East Pallant

Chichester

West Sussex

PO19 1TY

Tel: 01243 785166

www.chichester.gov.uk



A meeting of the **Cabinet** will be held in the Committee Rooms at East Pallant House on **Tuesday 7 March 2017 at 09:30**

MEMBERS: Mr A Dignum (Chairman), Mrs E Lintill (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Barrow, Mrs P Hardwick, Mrs G Keegan, Mrs P Plant, Mrs C Purnell and Mrs S Taylor

SECOND AGENDA SUPPLEMENT

BACKGROUND PAPERS FOR AGENDA ITEMS 6 AND 8

6 **Consideration of Consultation Responses and Modifications to Chichester District Council's Infrastructure Business Plan 2017-2022** (pages 1 to 9)

(1) Meeting the Financial Demand for School Expansions in Chichester

(2) Bike It Project.

8 **Senior Staff Pay Policy Statement** (pages 10 to 13)

Equality Impact Services – Guidance for Services

Background Paper 1

Meeting the Financial Demand for School Expansions in Chichester

Report by: Graham Olway, Principal Manager, Capital Planning & Projects, West Sussex County Council

Introduction

The County Council has been working in partnership with Chichester District Council to identify infrastructure needed to support development set out in the Local Plan. For the Chichester Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP), the County Council supports the approach whereby an assumption of 50% funding from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for all primary school expansions is applied, unless there is more up to date information available on the Basic Need grant. At the last Infrastructure Joint Member Liaison Group meeting on 2nd September, the County Council was requested to provide evidence to support the assumption that school expansion projects in the IBP would be part funded from the CIL.

Background

West Sussex County Council as the local authority has a statutory responsibility for ensuring that there are sufficient schools, and therefore school places in its geographic area. The County Council regularly assesses demographic changes, plans and finances new school places, including using funding provided by the Department for Education and other sources. There is a range of possible solutions to provide new places, mainly:

- building new schools;
- permanent or temporary extensions; or
- converting existing spaces for use as classrooms.

In planning for new school places, the County Council adopts a practice of ensuring value for money in using public funds but also seeks to maximise the use of grant and other funding.

In November 2016, recognising the fact that the CIL regulations are currently under review, representatives of all local authorities in England & Wales wrote to Lord Nash, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Schools explaining the difficulties faced by local authorities who are responsible for school place planning due to the introduction of CIL. For the County Council, the uncertainty regarding developer contributions alongside expectations of reduced grant funding means that the funding for future projects is increasingly uncertain.

Pupil numbers

In the 2016 Planning School Places booklet produced by the County Council, it details the need for some 25,515 extra school places across West Sussex by 2031 to meet the anticipated child product from strategic housing development sites identified / allocated in the District / Borough Local Plans. In the Chichester District Council area this is estimated as some 3,468 additional school places¹ needed by 2031 and this equates to the equivalent of eight new 2 Form Entry Primary Schools of 420 pupils each. These numbers include allowances for the proposed new primary schools to serve Graylingwell, West of Chichester and Tangmere together with expansions at other schools in the localities (Bourne, Manhood, Chichester, North of District) as detailed in the County's Planning School Places 2016 booklet and the Chichester IBP.

Options

The provision of new schools is expected across the locality. Where there is an expected need for a whole new school, the local authority is no longer able to legally establish new schools and all new schools must be academies. There are two options for establishing new schools and these are either i) the local authority advertising for an academy sponsor through the academy presumption process and this would require the County Council to fully fund the delivery of the new school or ii) for the local authority to rely on the Government's Free School programme to deliver a new school essentially free of charge to the local authority.

Whilst the provision of new schools is expected across the locality, much of the additional pupil places are still expected to be met from expanding existing school provision. The four projects identified in the Chichester IBP for primary school expansions over the next five years are focused on expanding provision within the school planning localities of Bourne, Manhood, Chichester and North of the District. As development comes forward, further work will be undertaken to identify suitable schools to be expanded within each locality to mitigate the impact of housing development. Feasibility work will then be undertaken and more details on cost will be set out, as projects will vary in scale and cost.

School expansion projects in Chichester

Historically, the County Council has sought S106 developer contributions to mitigate the impact of planned housing development alongside funding received from central government. With the introduction of the CIL this has led to developer contributions being split across either S106 or CIL, subject to circumstances, and has resulted in less certainty of the County Council being able to use such funds for the investment in local school provision. The level of County Council grant funding from the DfE is very uncertain and does not meet the full cost of school expansions thereby requiring additional funding sources to be secured so that educational provision and wider community benefits from school buildings can be achieved.

¹ This includes the area of the District within the South Downs National Park.

The following table sets out the cost of recent primary school expansions within the District in the last five years. The table sets out the project costs and proportion of S106 funding that was available for the projects.

Project name (school expansion)	No. of additional school places	Cost	Basic Need (& other funding)	S106	% funded by developer contributions
Parklands Primary	210 (1FE)	£3,890,000	£2,959,000	£931,000	24%
St Richards Catholic Primary	105 (1/2FE)	£1,325,000	£1,136,000	£189,000	14%

Funding

Local authorities receive capital grant funding from the Department for Education (DfE) to help towards the cost of new school places. In March 2013, the National Audit Office (NAO) published a Report 'Capital funding for new school places' that commented, amongst a range of issues, that the DfE was assuming the grant funding would be targeted mainly at extensions to existing schools and that the DfE estimates of building costs needed to be updated.

The DfE also assumed that local authorities would meet any difference between actual costs and the funding it provided. The DfE initially assumed that local authorities would contribute 20 per cent towards the cost of new places. This planning assumption was not evidence-based and was not communicated to local authorities. In the NAO survey, local authorities reported making an average contribution across England in 2012-13 of 34 per cent which meant most local authorities drew on other sources of funding e.g. S106 to finance new places in both new schools and expansions and this is also the case in West Sussex.

Conclusion

The County Council has been proactive in securing value for money in delivering new school places. The incorporation of developer contributions (S106 and CIL funding) is important to help mitigate the impact of housing development and meet the recognised gap in funding to provide new school places. Recent delivery of primary school expansion projects have utilised up to 24 per cent of developer contributions towards the total cost. Nationally, it has been shown that the Basic Need grant has only delivered around 66 per cent of the funding for new school places. In the context of planned development in Chichester and anticipated reduced government funding, it is considered that 50% is an appropriate working assumption

for primary school expansion projects that are part funded by the CIL until the County Council has more up to date information available on the Basic Need grant. Each project will then be considered in the context of mitigating the impacts of planned housing development and grant funding availability.

**Chichester Infrastructure Joint Member Liaison Group:
Bike It Project**

Report by: Andy Ekinsmyth, Service Manager, Transport & Countryside Services, West Sussex County Council

Introduction

The County Council has worked in partnership with Chichester District Council to develop a package of transport measures to support the Local Plan. The approach is to mitigate the impact of increased car trips on the highway network by increasing the use of sustainable modes of transport in addition to modest increases in capacity of the local road network. For the sustainable transport element this is comprised of new and improved infrastructure and complementary behaviour change initiatives. At the last infrastructure Joint Member Liaison Group meeting on 2nd September, the County Council was requested to provide evidence to support the inclusion of Smarter Choices projects in the CIL spending plan within the Chichester Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP).

Background

In recent years there has been growing interest in a range of initiatives which are now widely known as 'soft' transport measures or behaviour change initiatives, also known as 'Smarter Choices' measures. These measures seek to give people better information, opportunities and skills so that they are able and confident to choose transport options other than their car. Such programmes therefore allow people to form or change their travel behaviour in the long term and typically include workplace and school travel plans; personalised travel planning, travel awareness campaigns, public transport information and marketing; car clubs and car sharing schemes. These initiatives are also used to promote new infrastructure often provided by development. In addition, these can also include education and training initiatives that promote and nurture improved confidence in walking and cycling.

Increases in residential development and higher pupil numbers will potentially lead to increased congestion and impacts on air quality, unless measures are introduced to reduce car use. Evaluation of travel behaviour change programmes undertaken as part of the Department for Transport 'Sustainable Travel Towns' revealed an estimated benefit-cost ratio in the order of 9 to 1, when considering the combined congestion, environmental, consumer-benefit and health effects¹. This means that for every £1 spent on Smarter Choice Programmes, approximately £9 worth of benefit was estimated.

¹ Sloman, L. et al. 'The Effects of Smarter Choice Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns', DfT, 2010 <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20111005180138/http://assets.dft.gov.uk/publications/the-effects-of-smarter-choice-programmes-in-the-sustainable-travel-towns-summary-report/summaryreport.pdf>; DfT evaluation of three nominated 'Sustainable Travel Towns' (Darlington, Peterborough and Worcester) between 2004 and 2008.

Chichester Local Plan

Chichester city, due to its historic nature, has limited scope for large scale improvements to the local road network. It is however conducive to sustainable travel due to its flat and compact nature as demonstrated by 2011 Census statistics, which shows that the city has the highest levels of walking and cycling to work across West Sussex². To accommodate housing and employment development within and around the city, it is important that there are opportunities to build on and increase the use of sustainable modes of transport across the city and minimise the use of the private car.

The Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies recognises the importance of sustainable modes of transport and measures to promote behavioural change in travel choices. Policy 13: Chichester City Transport explains that CDC will work in partnership with the County Council to deliver an integrated transport strategy for Chichester city with proposed measures including behaviour change initiatives. The transport evidence base³ to support the Local Plan applied a 7% reduction in car trips to / from Chichester City Centre in 2031 to represent the effects of area wide Smarter Choices measures. The study demonstrates that the proposed package of transport improvements and smarter choice measures would be effective in mitigating the impacts of development allocated in the Local Plan, which meets the key test outlined in national planning guidance.

Delivery of Travel Behaviour Change Projects

The County Council has significant experience in delivering smarter choices programmes. The West Sussex Sustainable Travel Towns Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) promoted travel behaviour change initiatives in Chichester and Horsham. The project evaluation report⁴ March 2016 suggested the school related activities demonstrated the most positive outcomes in respect of behaviour change from the LSTF programme. The report also recommended that behaviour change initiatives should be focused in locations where there are high quality improvements to the sustainable transport infrastructure or the sustainable transport offer being provided.

Given these conclusions, the Local Plan assumptions and the infrastructure projects identified in the IBP, travel behaviour change interventions are needed to help to mitigate the impact of growth in car use. To ensure that the project is effective, focus will be placed on new residents and those most likely to change travel habits and where there are infrastructure improvements. It is therefore proposed that the focus for investment is on 'Bike It'.

² https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/media/4622/censusbulletin_traveltowork.pdf

³Transport Study of Strategic Development Options and Sustainable Transport Measures, Jacobs, 2013.

⁴ <http://www.chichester.gov.uk/studies#infrastructure>

⁴ https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/media/8577/west_sussex_sustainable_travel_towns_lstf_project_evaluation_report.pdf

Bike It

The County Council has previously worked in partnership with Sustrans to deliver Bike It projects across West Sussex. Bike It seeks to increase cycling and other active modes of travel both inside and outside of school whilst also decreasing car trips for the school drop-off and teachers. This is a partnership initiative between a Sustrans Project Officer and schools to target an increase in cycling for the journey to and from school. Bike It aims to create a culture of cycling at project schools that can be sustained once the Project Officer has departed. Whilst the promotion of cycling is at the forefront of this initiative, Bike It also actively promotes and seeks to influence increases in walking and use of public transport (despite the name focusing only on cycling). Working with school communities in this way can help to encourage them to actively promote ways of reducing congestion at drop off and pick up times. This will help build confidence in active travel modes amongst pupils that will also impact on non-school related travel behaviours.

Bike It involves the engagement of school management, teachers, pupils and parents, typically with the overall aims of:

- increasing the level of cycling to school to 20% of all young people, or to double regular cycling levels where the baseline level of regular cycling is lower than 10% of pupils;
- reducing the number of young people travelling to school by car – with a shift to active travel modes or use of public transport;
- raising awareness of the benefits of active travel; and
- creating a culture of active travel within project schools that can be sustained once the Project Officer has departed.

Bike It seeks to provide a legacy by progressively shifting ownership and responsibility for the project from the project officer to the wider school community and implementing a long-lasting cultural change.

Cycling from Previous 2 Year LSTF Projects in Chichester & Horsham

- 2013/14 cohort: Regular cycling increased from 8.4% at baseline to 24.0% after two years of engagement
- 2014/15 cohort: Regular cycling increased from 12.2% at baseline to 28.9% after one year of engagement

Scooting

- 2013/14 cohort: Regular scoot/skating increased from 10.0% at baseline to 27.6% after two years of engagement
- 2014/15 cohort: Regular scoot/skating increased from 19.2% at baseline to 32.0% after one year of engagement

Walking

- 2013/14 cohort: Regular walking increased from 44.7% at baseline to 50.5% after two years of engagement
- 2014/15 cohort: Regular walking increased from 45.8% at baseline to 52.6% after one year of engagement

Car use

- 2013/14 cohort: Usually being driven to school decreased from 31.6% at baseline to 28.5% after two years of engagement
- 2014/15 cohort: Usually being driven to school decreased from 47.6% at baseline to 32.5% after one year of engagement

Project Cost

The cost of a full time officer with associated events and monitoring is in the region of £60k pa. This could include support of up to 12 schools (based on three years). The Bike It project will identify capital improvement needs resulting from increased levels of cycling such as enhanced bike or scooter parking on school sites together with improvements on routes into schools. These will be identified during year 1 and will respond directly to customer needs and priorities to best influence sustainable shifts in travel patterns. Any capital improvement works will be delivered in conjunction with the County Council's Safer Routes to School programme and the emerging Cycling and Walking delivery programme. These programmes seek access to developer contributions to achieve improved value for money. This is an important aspect as often capital improvements can remove the barriers that deter sustainable travel choice, which can be identified more effectively through direct engagement with school communities and users.

1 FTE Bike It Officer	12 months Year 1 (18/19)	12 months Year 2 (19/20)	12 months Year 3 (20/21)	12 months Year 4 (21/22)	12 months Year 5 (22/23)
Rate	260	265	270	275	280
Days	200	200	200	200	200
Total officer cost	52000	53000	54000	55000	56000
Monitoring & evaluation	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000
Project specific costs (events etc)	4000	4000	4000	4000	4000
Supporting capital improvements	0	15000	15000	20000	20000
Total cost (£)	58000	74000	75000	81000	82000

Proposed Chichester Schools Approach

It is envisaged that 12 schools will be selected for the Bike It project. Schools will be engaged where there will be the greatest impact from development, for example in and around the city centre. Schools that are more likely to increase in size or experience increased access needs will be strongly encouraged to participate in the project.

Agenda Item 8

Senior Staff Pay Policy Statement **Background Paper**

Equality Impact Assessments - Guidance for services

We have a legal duty to undertake equality impact assessments for race, disability and gender at the start of any new projects or policies, major changes in service delivery or any potential removal of services. Assessing the equality impact is something that most of us do without thinking about it, for example consideration of how people access any service that we provide or ensuring that certain groups do not face any barriers to what we are providing is often part of our everyday consideration. This thought process must however be documented as we may need to show it as evidence.

There are three possible impacts to consider as part of the assessment:

A positive impact

Where a policy, service or project improves equality of opportunity. For example providing an interpretation service for people where English is not their first language will enable them to understand and use our services

A negative or adverse impact

Where the policy, service or project disadvantages one or more of the equality groups. For example an event held with no induction loop facility would have a negative impact on some attendees with hearing impairments.

A neutral impact

Where a policy, service or project has similar impact upon equality groups whether they belong to an equality group or not.

How to Carry out an Equality Impact Assessment

For each policy or project that you are assessing you should think about all of the strands of equality and consider the areas of:

- **Accessibility**
 - Physical Facility Audit
 - Transport issues
 - Cost
 - Activity (involvement)
 - Equipment

- **Staff Training**
 - Disability Awareness
 - Equalities / Diversity
 - Service Specific

- **Monitoring**
 - Data Collection
 - Evaluation
 - Feedback and resulting adjustments in service delivery

- **Consultation**
 - In accordance with consultation strategy and guidance
 - Various appropriate methods of consultation

- **Communication**
 - Link and knowledge exchange with internal equalities team
 - Various methods of communicating where appropriate
 - Plain English
 - Information Distribution
 - In accordance with new Communication Strategy

Initial questions

Are monitoring stats available? How could monitoring be collected in future?

Any good practice examples available on diversity in this subject area?

What are the main activities of the policy and areas of work that it will involve?

Who are the main beneficiaries of the policy?

List any changes that you may be expecting to make to the policy over the next year

Documentation of Equality Impact Assessment

Name of Policy, service, project, decision; **Senior Staff Pay Policy Statement**

- a) **Does the policy affect men and women in different ways? e.g. flexible working arrangements might have a positive impact on women with caring responsibilities.**

You should consider any impact both men or women.

	Positive impact	Negative impact	Neutral	Reason
Gender	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

- b) **Does the policy affect people from different racial groups, e.g. will women from certain minority communities use the Council's swimming pool more often if same sex swimming arrangements are in place?**

You should consider the impact on all racial groups, this includes gypsies and travellers.

	Positive impact	Negative impact	Neutral	Reason
Race	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

- c) **How will the policy impact on people with disabilities, e.g. if information about Council Tax benefits are not made available in large print or alternative formats, access to such benefits might be denied to people with a visual impairment or learning disability.**

You should consider those with impairments such as mobility, sight, hearing, learning disabilities and mental health issues.

	Positive impact	Negative impact	Neutral	Reason
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

d)

	Positive impact	Negative impact	Neutral	Reason
Any other equality impact (all other Protected Characteristics)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Overall impact Low Medium High

Actions to be taken as a result of this impact assessment

Any other comments
This statement will further ensure that all decisions made about senior staff pay and benefits are made in a fair, transparent and accountable way.