



7 October 2024

Agenda Item: 8

## **REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SELECT COMMITTEE**

### **OUTCOMES TO THE REVIEW OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PUPIL PLACE PLANNING**

#### **Purpose of the Report**

1. To share the findings arising from the scrutiny task and finish review of secondary school place planning with the Children and Families Select Committee.
2. To seek the Select Committee's endorsement for the review's recommendations to be submitted to Cabinet.

#### **Information**

##### **Background**

3. At its meeting on 20 March 2023, the Children and Families Select Committee considered a report on Secondary School Place Planning. The report set out the position of secondary school place planning in Nottinghamshire in relation to both the overall sufficiency of school places and in terms of specific year group place pressures, and to enable the Select Committee to monitor the Council's discharge of its statutory duty in this area.
4. As part of their discussions, members noted that the Council's Children and Families department was responsible for assessing the future school place requirements, while the delivery of the needed places was then carried out by the Place department. Members considered that it was vital for the Children and Families and Place departments to work together closely for the effective delivery of the needed school places within the required timeframe. As a result, the Committee resolved:

***“That members of the Committee carry out a task and finish review on how the Children and Families and Place departments can best work together on projects being implemented to deliver additional school places”.***

##### **Review Scope**

5. Subsequent work was carried out to “scope” the review. This work was carried out by the Chairman of the Children and Families Select Committee, in consultation with the Service

Director for Education, Learning and Inclusion, the Service Director for Green Growth, Investment and Assets, and other officers. This work identified key objectives of the review as well as the strategic and legislative context in which the issues involved would be considered.

6. The key objectives set out for the review were:

- To review the methodology used by the Council to project the future demand for secondary school places across Nottinghamshire.
- To review how the potential delivery options are appraised when a need for additional secondary school places has been identified.
- To review how the current organisational processes, structure and capacity at the Council are used to deliver additional secondary school places.
- To review how the potential funding options are considered and utilised to ensure that the additional secondary school places delivered are sustainable and in the right places.
- To review how the Council engages with the Department for Education, academies and other key partners in the effective delivery of additional secondary school places.

### **Links to Council Priorities – The Nottinghamshire Plan 2021 – 2031**

7. The Nottinghamshire Plan 2021 – 2031 is an ambitious plan for the County Council that sets out the Council's strategic vision for the future of Nottinghamshire and the local authority. The activity in the Nottinghamshire Plan is built around achieving a bold 10-year vision for a 'healthy, prosperous and greener future for everyone'. This vision is supported by nine ambitions which will act as a framework for all County Council activity. The scoping of the review identified that the review would support the following ambitions that supported the overall vision of the Plan:

- Supporting communities and families
- Keeping children, vulnerable adults and communities safe
- Building skills that help people get good jobs
- Making Nottinghamshire somewhere people love to live, work and visit

### **The Review Process**

8. Two information gathering meetings took place on Tuesday 14 May and Tuesday 11 June 2024 involving the following Members of the Children and Families Select Committee:

Councillor Mike Introna  
Councillor Francis Purdue-Horan  
Councillor Anne Callaghan BEM  
Councillor Nigel Turner  
Councillor Michelle Welsh  
James McGeachie – Co-opted Member

Councillor Sam Smith, the Cabinet Member for Education and Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) attended the first meeting of the Review Group.

9. The following council officers attended these sessions:

Wayne Bexton – Service Director for Green Growth, Investment and Assets  
Martin Elliott – Senior Scrutiny Officer  
Neil Gamble – Group Manager for Property Asset Management  
Katherine Harclerode – Democratic Services Officer  
Karen Hughman – Group Manager for Education Access Standards and Safeguarding  
Steve Holland – Senior Pupil Place Planning Practitioner  
James Lavender – Democratic Services Officer  
Will Lawrence – Developer Contributions Practitioner  
Peter McConnochie – Service Director for Education, Learning and Inclusion  
Mike Sharpe – Place Planning and Admissions Team Manager

### **Council's Statutory Responsibilities**

10. Local Authorities (LAs) are responsible for providing sufficient school places to meet the needs of the local population as per the requirements of Section 14 of the Education Act 1996. The Department for Education (DfE) requires this function to be discharged through planning areas. The DfE defines planning areas as '*mutually exclusive groups of schools that represent admissions patterns and reasonable alternatives to one another. We would usually expect this to mean geographic clusters of schools within reasonable travel distance of one another*'.
11. Planning areas are administrative entities that enable school place sufficiency to be assessed and for appropriate mitigations to be put in place. Planning areas must be approved by the DfE and should be reviewed every five years to ensure that they continue to allow accurate projections of future place sufficiency.

### **Methodology and Context**

12. The annual pupil projections are submitted to, analysed, and approved by the DfE through the School Capacity Survey (SCAP). The methodology used by the County Council is like those used by other Councils in England and is agreed by the DfE. The projections are submitted to the DfE in relation to planning areas and are 'best estimates' that reflect a range of factors, including previous school intakes. These pupil projections compare two key elements: the demand for school places (the number of pupils that are likely to require school places) and the supply of school places (the capacity of schools to accommodate those pupils).

### **Pupil projections - Demand**

13. The factors that influence projected demand for secondary school places include:
- Historical patterns of pupil transfers from primary to secondary schools.
  - Recruitment from out of catchment/out of county.
  - The existing primary school-age population (via the school census).
  - In-year pupil movements between schools and planning areas.

- In-year arrivals in and departures from schools and planning areas.
- For year 7, actual allocations made by the June of the current admissions round.
- Office of National Statistics (ONS) core population estimates.
- The number of new housing commitments that are identified by district and borough councils. In accordance with DfE guidance, only developments with a high probability of delivery within the next seven years may be reflected in secondary pupil projections. Such developments typically will have been granted planning permission.

14. At county level, estimated pupil numbers for the first year of the projections period are generally 97-99% accurate. At planning area level, accuracy varies but small over-estimates are common. Due to the range of variables involved, particularly the delivery and occupation of new housing, projected pupil numbers get less accurate the further into the future that they look. There are also certain unforeseen factors which can impact on the pupil place projections, for example, the increase of immigration of Hong Kong citizens to the UK and the arrival of Ukrainian refugees that can impact on the estimates around pupil numbers. Pupil place planning is also determined by general population numbers, which are anticipated through the analysis of GP registration data and the schools' census. Nottinghamshire's pupil projections methodology automatically takes account of cross-border pupil movements, whether that is between planning areas or between local authorities, such as Nottingham City-based pupils studying in county schools and Newark-based pupils studying in Lincolnshire schools. Data sharing between the County Council, and district and borough councils, around housing is crucial for the accuracy of projections.

15. Emphasis is placed on how the SCAP Survey is an estimated projection of school places over the next several years. The DfE provides formulas to assist with the determination of whether a school can meet pupil place capacity, but they also sign off on the methodology used by the Pupil Place Planning (PPP) Team to determine the number of pupil places per school. Overall, there is strong confidence in the accuracy of the model used by the Council in determining pupil place capacity.

### **Pupil Projections – Supply**

16. For projections purposes, the supply of secondary school places can best be understood in terms of net capacity; in other words, the physical capacity of schools to meet projected demand.

17. As all but one of Nottinghamshire's secondary schools are academies, their capacities can only be calculated based on one of two measures:

- The figures stated in academy funding agreements.
- A calculation based on the current year's Published Admission Number (PAN), which refers to the number of places that a school has agreed to make available to applicants. This can only be used where an academy's PANs and Numbers on Roll (NoR) have clearly and consistently exceeded the capacity stated in their funding agreement.

18. There can however be difficulties with using the academy funding agreements as many of these are over ten years old. Experience suggests that neither measure accurately represents the potential actual capacity available.

19. The DfE has begun a programme to assess the capacity of all secondary schools. However, this will not be completed in time to respond to current challenges around the provision of sufficient school places. In the meantime, the Arc Partnership Ltd have been commissioned to undertake independent net capacity assessments of some secondary schools, which have revealed potentially greater capacity than is formally recognised.

### **Addressing insufficiency**

20. Academy trusts, as independent bodies, can have priorities that may not always align with those of the Council. This means that the Council has less influence over creating additional pupil capacity within secondary schools than they do with primary schools, many of which are LA-maintained.

21. The secondary school curriculum and nature of secondary education also requires more infrastructure than needs to be provided in primary schools, for example, specialist teaching facilities, IT rooms, science labs, parking, pick-up and drop-off facilities. As such, it is more costly to expand existing or build new secondary schools than it would be for primary schools.

22. Some secondary schools are included in the DfE's School Rebuilding Programme. Whilst this is welcome, the rebuilt schools will be completed too late to address the current increase in pupil numbers. It would also not be an effective use of limited resources to add permanent capacity at a school that was due to be demolished and rebuilt.

23. An insufficiency of places in statutory year groups can be masked by spare capacity in post-16 places. The DfE has advised that under or un-used post-16 capacity should be made available where necessary for statutory place provision, however some academy trusts are reluctant to release this capacity without additional capital or revenue funding being made available.

24. Where pupil projections indicate an insufficiency of school places in a planning area, the PPP Team may submit a Project Initiation Document (PID) to the Strategic School Place Planning Board (SSPPB). The SSPPB comprises representatives from the Arc Partnership Ltd, PPP, various teams with expertise in property and planning, and Legal Services. The Board includes service directors.

Each PID includes a proposal informed by a range of factors including:

- projected level of need.
- the potential for further housing, including after the projections period.
- patterns of recruitment from outside the planning area.
- current school oversubscription criteria.
- existing school capacity.
- the ability of existing schools to expand (as identified by independent assessments by Arc Partnership Ltd).
- land availability.
- available funding.

SSPPB members examine each PID and, where appropriate, recommends the proposed approach. This recommendation is then discussed with the lead member for schools who, with support from senior officers determines the next steps.

Where there is a larger number of pupils in certain year groups, secondary schools may be able to admit more pupils, most commonly in Year 7, than is suggested by their PAN.

### **Academy Admission Criteria**

25. Catchment areas for Nottinghamshire schools are arrived at through consultation. In almost every instance the catchment areas of schools stay within the Council's boundaries. Many academies however have link primary schools outside of Nottinghamshire. These arrangements boost out of county recruitment. The County Council cannot prevent academies from creating links with any school. Whilst pupils cannot be rejected based on the grounds of whether they live outside of Nottinghamshire, the admissions criteria can be amended to benefit pupils based within the county. If the Council is of the view that an academy is not providing sufficient pupil places for Nottinghamshire-based pupils, they can object to the process through the Office for Schools Adjudicator. As of August 2023, Nottinghamshire was a net importer of pupils from out of county: over 1500 applications were received from residents outside of Nottinghamshire for Nottinghamshire school places.

### **Permanent or temporary expansions**

26. The most effective long term solution to accommodate additional pupils is for a permanent expansion to an existing school, as this can meet a long-term projected need for pupil places within a shorter construction timeframe than a new build solution. Many Nottinghamshire secondary schools sit on sites which allow for expansion. Permanent expansions build on the performance and reputation of existing schools, and only Ofsted-rated Good and Outstanding schools are usually expanded. Temporary classrooms are commonly used when there is a short-term larger number of pupils in a year group during the secondary phase. This is also an interim solution if the school is already subject to the DfE's School Rebuilding Programme.
27. Examples of recently completed secondary school expansions include Carlton le Willows Academy, where 28 new classrooms and associated circulation space were constructed at a cost of £14.1 million. Rushcliffe Spencer Academy has also had a new teaching block constructed and two teaching blocks remodelled at a cost of £27 million. Other examples of recent secondary school expansions include South Notts Academy, South Wolds Academy, Manor Academy and Carlton Academy.

### **Construction of new secondary schools**

28. In certain circumstances, the construction of a new secondary school may be a better option. This would be the case if some existing schools have reached their limit in terms of expansion. The scope for expansion is not limitless and is governed by legislation, particularly that relating to the loss of playing fields. Such concerns are often identified through the ongoing programme of site assessments by Arc Partnership Ltd.
29. A new school would be most appropriate where there is a high level of probability that a large housing development will be built in an area and where demand for places is already high and existing schools cannot expand to the required size. A new school may also be considered if the Council is confident that the new school will serve a specific local community of Nottinghamshire residents. This would mostly be the case only for major new housing

developments, for example, the Gamston-Tollerton housing development, which is in an area where existing schools are already full and where it would be difficult to expand when the school expansion projects already being undertaken and/or considered have been completed.

30. Building a new secondary school also allows for new design and technologies to be utilised, particularly with the schools designed to achieve Net Zero. These new builds would also not require maintenance for the first 10-15 years of their operation and would not have issues with the removal of old building materials such as asbestos that can be an issue on existing school sites. Due to the size of the site required for building new secondary schools, there would also be room for them to expand if needed.

### **Utilisation of land for new secondary schools**

31. The Council's Place department has considered various Council-owned sites for new special schools. However, after detailed site analysis the majority of these were eliminated as unsuitable.
32. The Council, when confronted with the place sufficiency implications of large housing developments, must examine a range of options. In Rushcliffe, the Council has arrived at a mixed approach; at Rushcliffe Spencer Academy, Toot Hill in Bingham and at South Wolds Academy the cost benefit analysis indicated that expanding existing schools was the best approach. However, in the Gamston/Tollerton area where there is a 4,000 dwelling settlement being proposed there is a plan in place to deliver sufficiency through a new school. Decisions like these are taken giving due consideration to cost, the existing school estate and the timeframes involved.
33. In most cases of projected pupil place expansion, a new secondary school is seldom the preferred solution because of the following considerations:
- More than 6 hectares of land would be needed. Generally, a bigger site would be preferred to allow for future expansion, so an 8-hectare site would probably be considered as a minimum. Such parcels of land are very rarely available. Housing developers are very reluctant to make them available, given the residential land value which would be lost.
  - New secondary schools are very expensive. A typical example of costs is that for every form of entry, a cost of £10m could be seen as a benchmark. As secondary schools of 4FE (600 places + 6th form) are considered a minimum sustainable size, £40m could be seen as a starting point. Nottinghamshire's Developer Contributions Strategy would be likely to generate a maximum of only £15m-£20m. Therefore, alternative funding streams would be required to deliver new secondary schools. Additional costs would also be incurred if the project overran.
  - A new school would require public consultation, to which existing schools would be likely to respond negatively due to concerns about their own viability.
  - It would probably be subject to a planning inquiry, which would need to establish that there was no alternative to a new school.

- Projected insufficiencies in most planning areas are usually below the level that would necessitate a new school (a shortage of 600-750 places, plus post-16 capacity).
- Lead/delivery times mean that the County Council would need a high level of certainty regarding demand in five years' time and beyond. Given the range of variables, that can rarely be a given.

### **Capital projects – processes.**

34. Once a proposed solution, either an expansion, temporary classrooms, or a new school, has been recommended by SSPPB, the proposed project then progresses through internal and external processes/procedures. Nottinghamshire's internal processes recognise the importance of accountability, evidenced decision-making, and a clear audit trail. However, these processes take time. The process steps include:

- Step 1 - Approval from Cabinet Member (CYP) and the Economic Development and Asset Management Committee (EDAM)
- Step 2 - Outline and full business cases
- Step 3 - Liaison with schools/trusts
- Step 4 - Feasibility and cost estimation
- Step 5 - Scrutiny of feasibility reports and costs
- Step 6 - Detailed design (often including Grant Funding Agreements)
- Step 7 - Applications for planning permission
- Step 8 - Construction
- Step 9 - Informal consultation and Free School Presumption (new schools only)
- Step 10 - Private Finance Initiative

Once SSPPB have identified potential school extension or new school construction opportunities, the Planning and PPP Teams collate information into a detailed progress flow chart to identify the timeframes for the delivery of such projects. The progress flow chart is reviewed every six months. Comparisons are made with partners and other local authorities in order to capture best practice and refine and review the process flow chart.

### **Section 106/Community Infrastructure Levy contributions and challenges within the planning process**

35. The financial mechanism which is most utilised by the County Council to contribute towards the cost of pupil places is through Section 106 (s106) agreements. As per Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, a s106 agreement allows a LPA to enter into a legally binding agreement or planning obligation with a landowner/applicant as part of the granting of planning permission. Such planning obligations can include asking the applicant to provide financial contributions towards school places, particularly if the planning application was for a large-scale residential development.

36. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a mechanism that allows local planning authorities to request property developers to contribute part of the cost of an approved development towards improvements to the wider local community, which can include money towards additional primary and secondary school places. For example, CIL payments worth £4 million from developments in Bassetlaw were used to expand Portland Academy in Worksop and £1.5 million was used from developments in Newark and Sherwood to expand



Joseph Whitaker Secondary School in Rainworth. However, it is a discretionary mechanism so not all local planning authorities in Nottinghamshire have a CIL in place.

37. In some instances, both CIL and s106 payments can be utilised together to pay for more pupil places, for example, whilst CIL payments from developments in Newark and Sherwood were used to fund pupil places at Joseph Whittaker Secondary School in Rainworth, S106 payments from developments in Mansfield were also used.

## **Review activity and recommendations**

### **Admissions criteria**

38. Members of the review group noted that there are surplus and deficits of school places in distinct planning areas within the districts and boroughs within Nottinghamshire, usually tied to local property development. For example, in Bassetlaw, where there is a surplus of places in Retford, there is a deficit of places in Worksop. The options used to address the deficit of secondary school places within a planning area include temporary and permanent school extensions, as well as negotiating with academy trusts to reintroduce catchment areas, which would give children living within the catchment area a higher priority within the oversubscription criteria than children living outside these catchment areas. There is no guarantee of a place for children resident within a catchment area or for children who subsequently move later.
39. Part of the Council's statutory responsibility is to check that the admission arrangements for all own admission authority schools in Nottinghamshire comply with the Code and the Admissions Team review these annually and raise any concerns about non-compliance with the admission authority and refer to the Office of the Schools Adjudicator (OSA) as necessary. Members of the review group agreed that it is beneficial for joint working between the Council and academy trusts around admissions criteria to help address deficits in secondary school pupil places within local planning areas of Nottinghamshire. It was noted that the County Council could recommend amendments to the criteria, including the introduction/reintroduction of catchment areas where this is considered to be unfair for families in certain areas.

### ***Recommendation One (a):***

***That the Admissions Team continues to work in partnership with academy trusts to ensure the admissions criteria for all schools are fair, clear and objective.***

### **Pupil Place Planning Data Sources**

40. Annual school census data enables Nottinghamshire to identify the geographical areas from which each academy has recruited its pupils. It was noted that there was cross local authority movement from of pupils between Nottinghamshire and surrounding local authorities.
41. Members of the review group welcomed the wide variety of data sources that are used in determining the number of pupils for a secondary school, including GP registration data that enabled the projections that were made around pupil numbers to be as accurate as possible. Members agreed that to ensure that projections were as accurate as possible that as wide range as of data sources should be used to ensure that they were as accurate as possible.

They also noted the specific formulas used by the PPP Team which were developed in conjunction with the DfE.

**Recommendation One (b):**

***That the Pupil Place Planning Team continues to utilise data from other sources to ensure the accuracy of the SCAP Survey.***

**Recommendation One (c):**

***That all Members receive an annual update from the Pupil Place Planning Team about the surplus and deficit of pupil places per planning area within Nottinghamshire, with the specific purpose of identifying areas which are experiencing a deficit of places and to investigate appropriate actions to remedy the deficit of places.***

**Academy Funding Agreements**

42. As noted, many of the Academy Funding Agreements that are an important factor in the calculations that are used to determine the delivery of school places were over ten years old. Members of the review group agreed that it was essential that these funding agreements were up to date when they played such an important role in funding the delivery of the required number of school places.

**Recommendation Two:**

***That the Children and Families Department, together with academy trusts, works with the Department for Education on updating Academy Funding Agreements for secondary schools within Nottinghamshire.***

**Use of s106 monies**

43. Members of the review group recognised the use of monies from a s106 agreement as part of a planning permission as a source of funding for secondary school places. The County Council may modify the purpose of a planning obligation where the s106 has prescribed that the monies must be spent at a specific school and it has become impossible to spend the contribution at the named school due to, for example, feasibility constraints or operational issues such as inadequate performance ratings by Ofsted. The County Council may also seek to modify the purpose of an obligation where the need for school places has changed over time and the original purpose has become obsolete, for example where the deficiency in local school places has moved from the primary education phase to the secondary education phase.
44. In these circumstances, the County Council would need to agree an alternative school with the developer and the LPA for inclusion in the amended s106. Such negotiations are led by the County Council's Planning Policy Team and, where a formal planning application is required by the LPA, the team will prepare and submit the application on behalf of the Council.
45. The difficulty with seeking a modification to a s106 is that it requires mutual agreement with all parties and there is no guarantee that all parties will agree to the proposed amendment.

There are also costs incurred in this process through legal fees, which would typically need to be covered by the County Council where the requested amendment is in its favour. The process can be resource intensive, especially where the County Council is required to submit a planning application, as a robust evidence base is necessary. The negotiations can be lengthy and become protracted.

46. A successful example of the reallocation of s106 monies to fund secondary school places include a recent application by the County Council recently applied to Gedling Borough Council (GBC) to redirect the contributions for a new primary school onsite associated with the Chase Farm Development (known as Park View) to a secondary education contribution. This application was approved by GBC and the contributions will be used to provide additional capacity (150 places) at the Carlton Academy.
47. To minimise the need to modify s106 agreements, the County Council seeks to maximise flexibility within the s106 from the outset. In accordance with its Developer Contributions Strategy (adopted 2021), the County Council will request that the education contribution is used within the 'pupil planning area', rather than any named school. This is to provide the County Council with the flexibility to spend the contribution at more than one school in the locality and respond to changing circumstances, such as school performance indicators or detailed feasibility work, as well as allowing contributions to be pooled towards holistic projects that meet the needs of more than one development. Where appropriate, and often in relation to large scale housing developments, the County Council may seek to include review clauses within the s106 which could enable the obligation to be reviewed and, if necessary, reallocated for a different purpose at a certain point within the development. For example, a s106 could include multiple options, with an option to fund an offside school expansion or a new school onsite, depending on future needs.

***Recommendation Three:***

***That the Planning and Pupil Place Planning Teams continue to refine the mechanisms which allows housing developer contributions to be reallocated to planning areas where there is a deficit of pupil places.***

**Pupil Planning Process**

48. As part of the review, members learnt about the processes that are used to manage the delivery school capital projects from initial analysis of potential demand for school in a planning area through to the delivery of a new school/existing school expansion. These project management tools are relatively new and is still being further developed and refined.
49. Members of the review group welcomed the introduction of these processes and how they were being used to deliver projects at pace by keeping activities on track and identifying which activities could be carried out simultaneously. Currently these processes are being used on individual development projects and did not allow for numerous projects to be tracked on the same chart. Members agreed that there was potential for its use and scope to be extended to manage multiple projects in one place that enable the timeframes of several projects to be monitored side by side. This would enable projects to be managed in the most timely way and would also support in further identifying potential short-term surplus and deficits within Nottinghamshire.

#### **Recommendation Four:**

***That the process management tools used for school capital projects continues to be refined to accommodate numerous school capital projects. The process should also be further developed using best practice from other local authorities.***

#### **Partnership working**

50. Officers noted that the SSPPB and the Arc Partnership Ltd worked with secondary schools to best utilise the land available on the school's grounds for anticipated expansions in pupil numbers. As most secondary schools in Nottinghamshire sit in plots with large parcels of land available for development, the Arc Partnership Ltd works with secondary schools to identify which parts of the land new classrooms and other school buildings can be built on. The SSPPB can then identify which schools are anticipating an increase in pupil places, which the school and the Arc Partnership Ltd can explain how they could accommodate this increase in pupil places through a school expansion. The recent school expansions of Carlton-le-Willows and Rushcliffe Spencer Academies are examples of this approach. Members of the review group were supportive of this approach as it helped schools utilise the space which they possessed to accommodate increases in pupil numbers within Nottinghamshire by using the existing secondary school infrastructure.

#### **Recommendation Five:**

***That work continues between the Strategic School Place Planning Board, Arc Partnership Ltd and secondary schools in Nottinghamshire to ensure the academy trusts are best utilising space with the potential of future development in anticipation of rises in demand for pupil places.***

#### **School governance arrangements**

51. Members of the review group noted that due to the independence of academy trusts, who had developed close ties with the Department of Education, the educational ambitions of the Council were not always as well aligned with those of academy trusts as they could be. Members agreed that the relationship between the Council and academy trusts is most beneficial where there are elected members of the Council sitting on the Board of a MAT or SAT, as they could use their knowledge of county council's educational ambitions and processes to provide opportunities for academies to grow and expand.

#### **Recommendation Six (a):**

***That the Children and Families Department continues to build closer working relationships with academy trusts in Nottinghamshire so that shared goals and support for secondary education can be achieved together.***

#### **Recommendation Six (b):**

***That Members be encouraged to express an interest in taking up a role on the Board of a local multi-academy trust or single-academy trust where a vacancy is advertised.***

52. Summary of recommendations:

	<b>Recommendation</b>
1.	<p>a) That the Admissions Team continues to work in partnership with academy trusts to ensure the admissions criteria for all schools are fair, clear and objective.</p> <p>b) That the Pupil Place Planning Team continues to utilise data from other sources to ensure the accuracy of the SCAP Survey.</p> <p>c) That all Members receive an annual update from the Pupil Place Planning Team about the surplus and deficit of pupil places per planning area within Nottinghamshire, with the specific purpose of identifying areas which are experiencing a deficit of places and to investigate appropriate actions to remedy the deficit of places.</p>
2.	That the Children and Families Department, together with academy trusts, works with the Department for Education on updating Academy Funding Agreements for secondary schools within Nottinghamshire.
3.	That the Planning and Pupil Place Planning Teams continue to refine the mechanisms which allows housing developer contributions to be reallocated to planning areas where there is a deficit of pupil places.
4.	That the process management tools used for school capital projects continues to be refined to accommodate numerous school capital projects. The process should also be further developed using best practice from other local authorities.
5.	That work continues between the Strategic School Place Planning Board, Arc Partnership Ltd and secondary schools in Nottinghamshire to ensure the academy trusts are best utilising space with the potential of future development in anticipation of rises in demand for pupil places.
6.	<p>a) That the Children and Families Department continues to build closer working relationships with academy trusts in Nottinghamshire so that shared goals and support for secondary education can be achieved together.</p> <p>b) That Members be encouraged to express an interest in taking up a role on the Board of a local multi-academy trust or single-academy trust where a vacancy is advertised.</p>

**Acknowledgements**

53. The Chairman and members of the review group would like to express their thanks to Peter McConnochie, Service Director for Education, Learning and Inclusion, Wayne Bexton, Service Director for Green Growth, Investment and Assets, and the service officers for their support provided during the review process.

## **Other Options Considered**

54. None. The recommendations of the review, if approved and to comply with the requirements of the Constitution are required to be submitted to Cabinet for their consideration.

## **Reason/s for Recommendation/s**

55. To comply with the requirements of the Constitution that the findings of a scrutiny review are submitted to the Cabinet for their consideration.

## **Statutory and Policy Implications**

56. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, data protection and information governance, finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (public health services), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and adults at risk, service users, smarter working, sustainability and the environment and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

## **Financial Implications**

57. There are no direct financial implication relating to the recommendations in the report.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1) That the recommendations of the scrutiny task and finish review of secondary school pupil place planning be endorsed and referred to the Cabinet.

**Councillor Mike Introna**  
**Chairman of the Children and Families Select Committee**

**For any enquiries about this report please contact:**

- Martin Elliott, Senior Scrutiny Officer, [martin.elliott@nottsc.gov.uk](mailto:martin.elliott@nottsc.gov.uk)
- James Lavender, Democratic Services Officer, [james.lavender@nottsc.gov.uk](mailto:james.lavender@nottsc.gov.uk)

## **Constitutional Comments (LPW 12/09/24)**

58. The recommendations fall within the Children and Families Select Committee by virtue of its terms of reference.

## **Financial Comments (SH 11/09/24)**

59. There are no additional financial implications arising from this report.

## **Background Papers and Published Documents**

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

- [Children and Families Select Committee, Monday 20 March 2023 – Agenda Item 5: Secondary School Place Planning](#)

## **Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected**

All