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Cabinet Reports
CABINET

12 OCTOBER 2010

CORPORATE DIRECTOR FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE’S SERVICES:
PAUL BURNETT

CABINET MEMBER WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE:
COUNCILLOR ANDREW GRANT

Subject: Proposal to extend Castle Primary School, Northampton and Upton Meadows Primary School

Recommendations: Cabinet are asked to:
1. acknowledge and support the consultation process; and
2. If there are no objections to the proposal in the consultation period, to delegate powers to the Corporate Director for Children and Young People to approve the issue of the public notice in January 2011.

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 It is proposed to extend the number of places for pupils aged 4-11 in permanent accommodation at Castle Primary School from 315 places to 420 places and Upton Meadows Primary School from 210 places to 420 places in order to meet the growth in population in the local areas.

1.2 As this is a significant enlargement, the County Council is required to go through a formal statutory process before it can go ahead with the proposals to increase the numbers at each school.

1.3 The capital implications of needing to build an extension to on both school sites were approved by Cabinet on 10 August 2010.

2. Relevant Priority Outcomes

As an organisation we have developed a set of principles which define what we are here for – our core purpose:
- We are here to help you help yourself
- We are here to help you when you can’t help yourself
- We want you to see us as a trusted advocate

Our perspectives and priority outcomes show how we will go about achieving our vision: “Proud to make Northamptonshire a great place to live and work”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customers - to achieve our vision, what will our customers</td>
<td>Young people feel engaged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Background

3.1 Castle Primary School is situated in St George’s Street, Northampton. In January 2010, the school had 321 pupils aged 4-11 on roll compared to its capacity of 315 places. The school also has a nursery unit that provides 78 part-time (39 full-time equivalent) places. The school serves an area to the north and west of the town centre.

3.2 The primary-aged population of the town centre is expected to increase because of a recent increase in the number of annual births. The table below shows that the number of births in the town centre has increased by approximately 100 over the last five years. It should be noted that reception intakes in local schools are usually around 70% of the number of births five years earlier, but even allowing for this trend, there is likely to be increased pressure on school places in the future.

Table 1: Annual Births in Northampton Town Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>No. Of Births</th>
<th>Year of Intake into Reception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2008/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2010/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>2013/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 The effect on standards is a key issue. In their last OFSTED inspection in March 2009, Castle Primary School was identified as an outstanding school. The report stated that “Castle is an outstanding school where pupils of all abilities and from a wide range of backgrounds achieve well. The popularity of the school has increased rapidly in recent years because parents and pupils appreciate and acknowledge the high quality care and exciting learning opportunities the school offers..... The headteacher, governors and senior management team lead the school exceptionally well, providing extremely effective and clear educational direction. The school has a vibrant ethos and staff make a strong commitment to provide each pupil with the best possible education.” We are confident that school will continue to provide a quality education following the proposed extension.

3.4 Castle has been identified for extension because:

I. The growth of the primary population in the local area;
II. The school is popular and recognised by OFSTED as outstanding;
III. There is a preference for schools to organise classes into single year groups and this would allow the school to organise into two classes per year group throughout; IV. The site has room for the extension.

3.5 Upton Meadows Primary School opened in September 2006 to serve the new development of Upton on the western outskirts of Northampton. The pupil roll has increased steadily as the development has progressed from 51 in January 2007 to reach 234 in January 2010.

3.6 In mid-2010, a total of 655 dwellings had been completed out of a total development of some 1,200 units. We would expect a development of this size to generate some 350 primary-aged pupils. In addition, the earlier development at Upton off Telford Way, contains approximately 50 primary pupils, which would give sufficient numbers to maintain a 420 place school.

3.7 The existing school was designed to be extended and it was the intention of the Council to do this as the housing development progressed and demand for places increased. Phase 2 will provide an additional six classrooms.

3.8 Upton Meadows Primary School was last inspected by OFSTED in January 2008. The school was designated as a good school. The report stated that “The school provides a good standard of education. Pupils thoroughly enjoy being at their new school, as confirmed by one pupil who stated, ‘School is great. Everyone is friendly and lessons are fun. We’ve got a great playground and field.’” We have no concerns that the proposal will have an impact on standards at the school.

4. Consultation and Scrutiny

4.1 Discussions have taken place between officers and schools over a number of months. This report seeks Cabinet approval to initiate the formal consultation process for the statutory part of the proposals concerning pupil numbers.

4.2 If approval is given, wide consultation will take place to comply with statutory requirements. Consultees include pupils, parents, trade unions, Peterborough (CE) Diocesan Board of Education, Northampton RE Service, MPs, local borough and county councillors, Northampton Borough Council, South Northamptonshire Council, Upton Parish Council, Early Years and Childcare Team, local early years settings, schools and local community groups.

4.3 It is intended that consultation on the changes in pupils number will run from October until Christmas 2010.

4.4 Feasibility studies have been done for each scheme in terms of the capital implications on each site. Schemes have been developed for each school in consultation with the Headteachers and Governing Bodies and are now at detailed design stage. Additional consultation will be held with staff, parents and local residents prior to submission of planning applications.

4.5 The process is being taken in accordance with guidance from the Department for Education, which can be found using the following link: http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/schoolorg/index.cfm
5. Alternative Options Considered

5.1 Do nothing. This was discounted because the growth in population will require additional school places.

5.2 Extend other schools. These schools have been identified as the preferred options. For the Upton Meadows proposal, the case is clear as this is the only school that serves this growing development. With reference to the Castle proposal, an objective options appraisal was undertaken and the needs of this school for expansion came top because of the reasons set out in paragraph 3.4.

6. Financial Implications

6.1 Finance for both schemes was authorised by the Corporate Management Team in July 2010 and approved in the Cabinet finance report of 10 August 2010. £2.125 million was approved for Castle Primary and £2.2 million for Upton. The Castle scheme will be delivered via the Northampton Schools Limited PFI contract. The Upton scheme will be conventionally procured via Source Northamptonshire.

6.2 Detailed design and a review of costs will be undertaken prior to tendering, and further Cabinet approval will be sought prior to contract award.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current year</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Investment</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>3909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded by</td>
<td>NCC Capital Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going costs (revenue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs – Staffing</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>118.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (property)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total on-going costs</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>133.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded by</td>
<td>Dedicated Schools Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs (capital &amp; revenue)</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>3951.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What benefits will the proposal deliver? Provide additional school places to meet the growth in demand

7. Risk and Business Continuity Management

a) Risk(s) associated with the proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Residual Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public support for the proposals</td>
<td>Public consultation planned.</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town planning issues</td>
<td>Extensive consultation on building design planned</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adverse impact on other schools | Unlikely as population growth in both areas. | AMBER

b) Risk(s) associated with not undertaking the proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council will be unable to meet its statutory duty to provide school places</td>
<td>RED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible costs of transporting children to other schools</td>
<td>RED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. List of Appendices

None

Author: Alan Fitz  
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Background Papers:  
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Does the report propose a key decision is taken? YES

If yes, is the decision in the Forward Plan? YES

Will further decisions be required? If so, please outline the timetable here

YES 2nd Cabinet Decision on 11 January 2011 on whether to issue the public notice following the consultation unless there are no objections in the initial consultation period. If this is the case the decision is delegated to the Corporate Director for Children and Young People. 3rd Cabinet Decision on 12 April 2011 to determine the proposal and agree the contract award arrangements for the capital works.

Is this report proposing an amendment to the budget and/or policy framework? NO

Have the financial implications been cleared by the Strategic Finance Manager (SFM)? YES  
Name of SFM: Pat Hudson

Have any capital spend implications been cleared by the Operation Management Team. YES

Has the report been cleared by the relevant Corporate Director or ACE? YES  
Name of Director: Paul Burnett

Has the relevant Cabinet Member been consulted? YES  
Cabinet Member: Andrew Grant

Has the relevant scrutiny committee been consulted? YES  
Scrutiny Committee: Children & Young People’s Service

Has the report been cleared by Legal Services? YES  
Name of solicitor: Shahin Ismail

Solicitor’s comments:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have any communications issues been cleared by Communications and Marketing?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of officer:</td>
<td>Eva Duffy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has an Equalities Impact Assessment been carried out in relation to this report?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any community safety implications?</td>
<td>None anticipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any environmental implications?</td>
<td>The new buildings are designed to meet the current environmental standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any Health &amp; Safety Implications:</td>
<td>YES The building work will be carried out in line with health and safety regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any Human Resources Implications:</td>
<td>YES Extending schools will require the employment of additional teaching and non-teaching staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any human rights implications:</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituency Interest:</td>
<td>Castle Proposal = Tony Clarke, Castle; Winston Strachan, St Crispin; Richard Church, Kingsley Upton Meadows Proposal = David Hugheston-Roberts, East Hunsbury; Don Edwards, Old Duston; Suresh Patel, St James</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Parents, Guardians and Members of the local community

PROPOSAL TO ENLARGE THE PREMISES OF CASTLE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Introduction

Northamptonshire County Council is beginning the formal process to extend Castle Primary School from 315 to 420 places in permanent accommodation from September 2012. This will allow the school’s admission number to remain at 60.

The school opened in its new premises in St George’s Street in April 2007 with enough room for 315 pupils and an admission number of 45. Since then, a temporary classroom was added to allow the school to admit 60 pupils in September 2009 and September 2010. It is now planned to replace the temporary classroom with a new build extension to take the permanent capacity to 420 places.

The regulations do not require a formal consultation for a temporary increase in capacity of a school, but the county council has recognised the need for a permanent extension and a formal consultation process is necessary.

Why Change?

The primary-aged population of the town centre is rising because of a recent increase in the number of annual births. This can be seen in the table over the page. It should be noted that the intakes at age 4 in local schools are usually around 70% of the number of births five years earlier, but even allowing for this trend, there is likely to be increased pressure on school places in the future.

This proposal to increase the capacity from 315 to 420 places will help us to provide some of these additional primary places.
There are a number of other reasons why the County Council is proposing to extend Castle Primary School:

i) The school is popular and recognised by OFSTED as outstanding and the Governing Body and the headteacher support the proposal;

ii) There is a preference for schools to organise classes into single year groups and this would allow the school to organise into two classes per year group throughout;

iii) The site has room for an extension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>No. Of Births</th>
<th>Year of Intake into Reception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2008/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2010/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>2013/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the proposed timetable?

12 October 2010. The County Council Cabinet gave approval for the proposal to go out for consultation.

November to December 2010. Consultation with parents, the local community, schools and other interested organisations to take into account the views expressed.

11 January 2011. The County Council Cabinet will decide to whether or not to proceed to the next stage of the process taking into account the comments made during the consultation.

If the Cabinet agrees to continue with the proposal, the next stage of the process is the issue of the public notice and a formal representation period of four weeks, during which responses can be made.

At the end of this period, the Cabinet will make the final decision on the proposal and agree to release the funding for the scheme. This is scheduled for the Cabinet meeting on 12 April 2011.

If the proposal is approved, a planning application for the scheme will be submitted and the new extension is planned to open in September 2012.
Have your say....

We welcome your feedback and are inviting you to take part in a consultation. We want to hear how you feel about the proposed changes. You can use the response form here, write to us, email us or give your response online through our website by clicking on “Consultation Register” at www.northamptonshire.gov.uk.

Please use this space to tell us what you think. This is not a referendum but a chance to make your views known so the county council can take them into account in making its decision. Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

Please send this form or a letter to:

Alan Fitz
Placement Planning Manager
Northamptonshire County Council
PO Box 216
John Dryden House
8-10 The Lakes
Northampton
NN4 7DD.

Alternatively it can be handed in at the school.

You can also email your response to castleconsultation@northamptonshire.gov.uk or telephone 01604 237702.

The closing date for comments is Friday 17 December 2010.

Yours sincerely

Alan Fitz
Pupil Placement Manager
CABINET
11 JANUARY 2011
CORPORATE DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE: PAUL BURNETT
CABINET MEMBER WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE:
COUNCILLOR ANDREW GRANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Proposal to extend the number of places at both Castle Primary School and Upton Meadows Primary School in Northampton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations:</td>
<td>Cabinet is asked to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. note the outcome of the consultation process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. agrees to issue the statutory public notice followed by a four week period for any representations; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. within a two month period thereafter for the proposals, any representations and supporting documentation to be referred back to Cabinet for its consideration and decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 It is proposed to extend the number of places for pupils aged 4-11 in permanent accommodation at Castle Primary School from 315 places to 420 places and Upton Meadows Primary School from 210 places to 420 places in order to meet the growth in population in the local areas.

1.2 As these are significant enlargements, the County Council is required to go through a formal statutory process before it can go ahead with the proposals to increase the numbers at each school.

1.3 The capital implications of needing to build an extension on both school sites were approved by Cabinet on 10 August 2010.

1.4 At its meeting on 12 October 2010, Cabinet supported the formal consultations on the proposed extensions for both schools. These consultations have now taken place and Cabinet is being asked to agree to proceed to the next step of the statutory process, which involves the issuing of the public notice and a further four week period for representations.

2. Relevant Priority Outcomes

As an organisation we have developed a set of principles which define what we are here for – our core purpose:
- We are here to help you to help yourself
- We are here to help you when you can’t help yourself
- We want you to see us as a trusted advocate

Our perspectives and priority outcomes show how we will go about achieving our vision: “Proud to make Northamptonshire a great place to live and work”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customers</strong> - to achieve our vision, what will our customers see?</td>
<td>• Young people feel engaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong> - to satisfy our customers, what processes must we excel at?</td>
<td>• Developing local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Commissioning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance</strong> – to finance our vision, what must we do efficiently, effectively and economically?</td>
<td>• Targeted spend and investments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Background

3.1 Castle Primary School is situated in St George’s Street, Northampton and is one of the schools in the Northampton Schools PFI contract. In January 2010, the school had 336 pupils aged 4-11 on roll compared to its permanent capacity of 315 places. A single mobile classroom has been added to allow the school to accommodate these additional pupils. The school also has a nursery unit that provides 78 part-time (39 full-time equivalent) places. The school serves an area to the north and west of the town centre.

3.2 The primary-aged population of the town centre is expected to increase because of a recent increase in the number of annual births. The table below shows that the number of births in the town centre has increased by approximately 100 over the last five years. It should be noted that reception intakes in local schools are usually around 70% of the number of births five years earlier, but even allowing for this trend, there is likely to be increased pressure on school places in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>No. Of Births</th>
<th>Year of Intake into Reception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2008/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2010/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>2013/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>2014/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 The effect on standards is a key issue. In their last OFSTED inspection in March 2009, Castle Primary School was identified as an outstanding school. The report stated that “Castle is an outstanding school where pupils of all abilities and from a wide range of backgrounds achieve well. The popularity of the school has increased rapidly in recent years because parents and pupils appreciate and acknowledge the
high quality care and exciting learning opportunities the school offers... The headteacher, governors and senior management team lead the school exceptionally well, providing extremely effective and clear educational direction. The school has a vibrant ethos and staff make a strong commitment to provide each pupil with the best possible education.” We are confident that the school will continue to provide a good quality education following the proposed extension.

3.4 Castle has been identified for extension because:
   i) There is growth of the primary population in the local area;
   ii) The school is popular and recognised by OFSTED as outstanding;
   iii) There is a preference for schools to organise classes into single year groups and this would allow the school to organise into two classes per year group throughout;
   iv) The site has room for the extension.

3.5 Upton Meadows Primary School opened in September 2006 to serve the new development of Upton on the western outskirts of Northampton. The pupil roll has increased steadily as the development has progressed from 51 in January 2007 to reach 248 in September 2010. The school has permanent capacity for 210 places. A temporary mobile was installed on site in the autumn of 2010 to provide additional teaching space for the rising numbers.

3.6 In mid-2010, a total of 655 dwellings had been completed out of a total development of some 1,200 units. We would expect a development of this size to generate some 350 primary-aged pupils. In addition, the earlier development at Upton off Telford Way, contains approximately 50 primary pupils, which would give sufficient numbers to maintain a 420 place school.

3.7 The existing school was designed to be extended and it was the intention of the Council to do this as the housing development progressed and demand for places increased. Phase 2 will provide an additional six classrooms.

3.8 Upton Meadows Primary School was last inspected by OFSTED in January 2008. The school was designated as a good school. The report stated that “The school provides a good standard of education. Pupils thoroughly enjoy being at their new school, as confirmed by one pupil who stated, ‘School is great. Everyone is friendly and lessons are fun. We’ve got a great playground and field.’” We have no concerns that the proposal will have an impact on standards at the school.

4. Consultation and Scrutiny

4.1 Discussions have taken place between officers and the schools over a number of months. Formal consultation began in the week beginning 1 November 2010 and lasted until the 24 December.

4.2 Consultation leaflets were circulated widely. Consultees include pupils, parents, trade unions, Peterborough (CE) Diocesan Board of Education, Northampton Religious (Catholic) Education Service, MPs, local borough and county councillors, Northampton Borough Council, South Northamptonshire Council, Upton Parish Council, Early Years and Childcare Team, local early years settings, schools and local community groups.
4.3 The proposals to extend Castle Primary School received three responses. All the responses were in favour of the proposed scheme. The Upton Meadows proposal received two written responses. One respondent was in favour of the proposal and one was against. The respondent, who was against the proposal, stated that it would make a small primary school into a big one, which would make it more impersonal. The school held a consultation evening in October 2010. At this, six parents posted comments in favour of the proposed expansion. All the responses are included in Appendix 2.

4.4 The process is being taken in accordance with guidance from the Department for Education, which can be found using the following link: http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/schoolorg/index.cfm

4.5 The building plans for each school are currently being developed. The scheme for Upton is at detailed design stage, including consultation with the planners, as the Phase 2 extension was part of the planning application for the initial building. On 20 October 2010, a pre-planning consultation evening was held at the school for parents and local residents, who welcomed the new extension. A similar consultation event will be held at Castle Primary when initial plans have been developed; the Headteacher, staff and Governing Body are working with the design team to identify the school’s requirements.

5. Alternative Options Considered

5.1 Do nothing. This was discounted because the growth in population will require additional school places.

5.2 Extend other schools. These schools have been identified as the preferred options. For the Upton Meadows proposal, the case is clear as this is the only school that serves this growing development. With reference to the Castle proposal, an objective options appraisal was undertaken and the needs of this school for expansion came top because of the reasons set out in paragraph 3.4.

6. Financial Implications

6.1 Capital finance for both schemes was authorised by the Corporate Management Team in July 2010 and approved in the Cabinet finance report of 10 August 2010. £2.125 million was approved for Castle Primary and £2.2 million for Upton.

6.2 The scheme for Upton will be tendered traditionally and will be advertised on ‘Source Northamptonshire’ in line with the Council’s procurement procedures. A different procurement route is required for Castle Primary School, as it forms part of the Northampton Schools PFI contract. Property & Asset Management and Legal Services are leading this work and further details will be provided in future Cabinet reports.

6.2 Detailed design and a review of capital costs will be undertaken prior to tendering, and further Cabinet approval will be sought prior to contract award. Further work is also being undertaken to establish the impact on revenue costs, including the implications for the Unitary Charge in the PFI contract regarding Castle Primary. Details of this will be provided in a future Cabinet report.
## Capital Investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current year</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded by</td>
<td>NCC Capital Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**On-going costs (revenue)**
- **Costs - Staffing**
  - Other
- **Total on-going costs**
- **Funded by**

| Total Costs (capital & revenue) | 337 | 3784 | 204 |

What benefits will the proposal deliver?
- Provide additional school places to meet the growth in demand

### 7. Risk and Business Continuity Management

#### a) Risk(s) associated with the proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Residual Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public support for the proposals</td>
<td>Only one objection received during the public consultations.</td>
<td>Amber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town planning issues</td>
<td>Extensive consultation on building design planned</td>
<td>Amber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse impact on other schools</td>
<td>Unlikely as population growth in both areas.</td>
<td>Amber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### b) Risk(s) associated with not undertaking the proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council will be unable to meet its statutory duty to provide school places</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible costs of transporting children to other schools</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. List of Appendices

**Appendix 1: Consultation Letters**

**Appendix 2: Responses received to the consultation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Name: Alan Fitz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team: Strategic Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Contact details | Tel: 01604 237702 Fax: 01604 236372 |
| Background Papers: | Cabinet Reports
August 2010 Item E2 Monthly Capital Programme
October 2010 Item B2 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the report propose a key decision is taken?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, is the decision in the Forward Plan?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Will further decisions be required? If so, please outline the timetable here | YES
Cabinet Decision on 12 April 2011 to determine the proposal and agree the contract award arrangements for the capital works. |
| Is this report proposing an amendment to the budget and/or policy framework? | NO |
| Have the financial implications been cleared by the Strategic Finance Manager (SFM)? | YES
Name of SFM: Jon Lee (revenue) and Glenn Hammons (capital) |
| Have any capital spend implications been cleared by the Operational Management Team (OMT) | |
| Has the report been cleared by the relevant Corporate Director or ACE? | YES
Name of Director: Paul Burnett |
| Has the relevant Cabinet Member been consulted? | YES
Cabinet Member: Andrew Grant |
| Has the relevant scrutiny committee been consulted? | NO
Scrutiny Committee: Children & Young People’s Service |
| Has the report been cleared by Legal Services? | YES
Name of solicitor: Gurdeep Sembhi
Solicitor’s comments: The expansion proposals must be published in accordance with the Education and Inspections Act 2006. |
| Have any communications issues been cleared by Communications and Marketing? | YES
Name of officer: Eva Duffy |
| Have any property issues been cleared by Property and Asset Management? | YES
Name of officer: John Pardoe |
| Has an Equalities Impact Assessment been carried out in relation to this report? | YES
http://www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/en/councilservices/Community/equalities/Pages/CYP-EIA.aspx |
| Are there any community safety implications? | None anticipated |
| Are there any environmental implications? | The new buildings are designed to meet the current environmental standards |
| Are there any Health & Safety Implications? | YES
The building work will be carried out in line with health and safety regulations. |
| Are there any Human Resources Implications: | YES  
Extending schools will require the employment of additional teaching and non-teaching staff. |
| Are there any human rights implications: | NO |
| Constituency Interest: | Castle Proposal = Tony Clarke, Castle; Winston Strachan, St Crispin; Richard Church, Kingsley  
Upton Meadows Proposal = David Hugheston-Roberts, East Hunsbury; Don Edwards, Old Duston; Suresh Patel, St James |
Subject: Proposal to extend Castle Primary School, Northampton and Upton Meadows Primary School

Recommendations: Cabinet is asked to:
1. approve the proposed expansion of Castle Primary School subject to satisfactory conclusion of the PFI negotiations within approved financial resources;
2. delegate authority to the Corporate Director for Environment, Growth and Commissioning in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holders to approve the execution of all the necessary documentation to facilitate the capital scheme at Castle Primary in the Northampton PFI contract;
3. approve the proposed expansion of Upton Meadows Primary School;
4. agree the capital project scheme for Upton Meadows Primary School so it can proceed to the construction phase within available and agreed financial resources; and
5. delegate authority to the Corporate Director for Children and Young People in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holders to approve, accept, award and appoint the preferred bidder and to execute or authorise the execution of all the necessary documentation to facilitate the Upton Meadows capital project scheme.

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 It is proposed to extend the number of places for pupils aged 4-11 in permanent accommodation at Castle Primary School from 315 places to 420 places and Upton Meadows Primary School from 210 places to 420 places in order to meet the growth in population in the local areas.

1.2 As these are significant enlargements, the County Council is required to go through a formal statutory process before it can go ahead with the proposals to increase the numbers at each school.

1.3 The capital implications of needing to build an extension on both school sites were approved by Cabinet on 10 August 2010.
1.4 At its meeting on 12 October 2010, Cabinet supported the formal consultations on the proposed extensions for both schools. These consultations took place and Cabinet agreed at its meeting on 11 January 2011 to proceed to the next step of the statutory process, which involves the issuing of the public notice and a further four week period for representations. Cabinet is now asked to make a final decision on the Upton Meadows proposal and give conditional approval to the Castle proposal subject to the PFI finance package being agreed at a future Cabinet meeting.

2. Relevant Priority Outcomes

As an organisation we have developed a set of principles which define what we are here for – our core purpose:

- We are here to help you to help yourself
- We are here to help you when you can’t help yourself
- We want you to see us as a trusted advocate

Our perspectives and priority outcomes show how we will go about achieving our vision: “Proud to make Northamptonshire a great place to live and work”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customers - to achieve our vision, what will our customers see?</td>
<td>• Young people feel engaged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Process - to satisfy our customers, what processes must we excel at? | • Developing local communities  
|                    | • Commissioning outcomes                     |
| Finance – to finance our vision, what must we do efficiently, effectively and economically? | • Targeted spend and investments |

3. Background

3.1 Castle Primary School is situated in St George’s Street, Northampton and is one of the schools in the Northampton Schools PFI contract. In January 2010, the school had 336 pupils aged 4-11 on roll compared to its permanent capacity of 315 places. A single mobile classroom has been added to allow the school to accommodate these additional pupils. The school also has a nursery unit that provides 78 part-time (39 full-time equivalent) places. The school serves an area to the north and west of the town centre.

3.2 The primary-aged population of the town centre is expected to increase because of a recent increase in the number of annual births. The table below shows that the number of births in the town centre has increased by approximately 100 over the last five years. It should be noted that reception intakes in local schools are usually around 70% of the number of births five years earlier, but even allowing for this trend, there is likely to be increased pressure on school places in the future.
Table 1: Annual Births in Northampton Town Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>No. Of Births</th>
<th>Year of Intake into Reception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2008/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2010/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>2013/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>2014/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 The effect on standards is a key issue. In their last OFSTED inspection in March 2009, Castle Primary School was identified as an outstanding school. The report stated that “Castle is an outstanding school where pupils of all abilities and from a wide range of backgrounds achieve well. The popularity of the school has increased rapidly in recent years because parents and pupils appreciate and acknowledge the high quality care and exciting learning opportunities the school offers..... The headteacher, governors and senior management team lead the school exceptionally well, providing extremely effective and clear educational direction. The school has a vibrant ethos and staff make a strong commitment to provide each pupil with the best possible education.” We are confident that the school will continue to provide a good quality education following the proposed extension.

3.4 Castle has been identified for extension because:
   i) There is growth of the primary population in the local area;
   ii) The school is popular and recognised by OFSTED as outstanding;
   iii) There is a preference for schools to organise classes into single year groups and this would allow the school to organise into two classes per year group throughout;
   iv) The site has room for the extension.

3.5 Upton Meadows Primary School opened in September 2006 to serve the new development of Upton on the western outskirts of Northampton. The pupil roll has increased steadily as the development has progressed from 51 in January 2007 to reach 248 in September 2010. The school has permanent capacity for 210 places. A temporary mobile was installed on site in the autumn of 2010 to provide additional teaching space for the rising numbers.

3.6 In mid-2010, a total of 655 dwellings had been completed out of a total development of some 1,200 units. We would expect a development of this size to generate some 350 primary-aged pupils. In addition, the earlier development at Upton off Telford Way, contains approximately 50 primary pupils, which would give sufficient numbers to maintain a 420 place school.

3.7 The existing school was designed to be extended and it was the intention of the Council to do this as the housing development progressed and demand for places increased. Phase 2 will provide an additional six classrooms.
3.8 Upton Meadows Primary School was last inspected by OFSTED in January 2008. The school was designated as a good school. The report stated that "The school provides a good standard of education. Pupils thoroughly enjoy being at their new school, as confirmed by one pupil who stated, 'School is great. Everyone is friendly and lessons are fun. We've got a great playground and field.'" We have no concerns that the proposal will have an impact on standards at the school.

4. Consultation and Scrutiny

4.1 Discussions have taken place between officers and the schools over a number of months. Formal consultation began in the week beginning 1 November 2010 and lasted until the 17 December. This was detailed in the Cabinet report of 11 January 2011.

4.2 The public notice was issued on 21 January 2011 with a period for representations of four weeks.

4.3 There were no representations relating to either proposal within the statutory period for representations.

4.4 The process is being taken in accordance with guidance from the Department for Education, which can be found using the following link: http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/schoolorg/index.cfm

4.5 On 20 October 2010, a pre-planning consultation evening was held at Upton Meadows for parents and local residents to view the proposals for the building extension. A planning application has been submitted and the scheme for Upton is now at Design Stage D for compilation of the tender information.

4.6 The plans for the proposed extension at Castle are currently being prepared by the PFI contractor, involving discussions with the school. A pre-planning consultation event will be held for parents and local residents once plans are more fully developed.

5. Alternative Options Considered

5.1 Do nothing. This was discounted because the growth in population will require additional school places.

5.2 Extend other schools. These schools have been identified as the preferred options. For the Upton Meadows proposal, the case is clear as this is the only school that serves this growing development. With reference to the Castle proposal, an objective options appraisal was undertaken and the needs of this school for expansion came top because of the reasons set out in paragraph 3.4.

6. Financial Implications

6.1 Capital finance for both schemes was authorised by the Corporate Management Team in July 2010 and approved in the Cabinet finance report of 10 August 2010. £2.125 million was approved for Castle Primary and £2.2 million for Upton.
6.2 For the Upton scheme, the procurement stage will start in the next month when it will be advertised on ‘Source Northamptonshire’ in line with the Council’s procurement procedures. Construction is expected to start in the summer holidays with an estimated completion date of May 2012.

6.3 The procurement route for the Castle scheme is different as it is part of the Northampton schools PFI contract. Property and Asset Management will manage the negotiation process with the PFI contractor with the aim of completing works by September 2012. Detailed design is currently underway prior to negotiations with the PFI provider regarding the impact on capital, lifecycle and facilities management costs. The capital and lifecycle costs will be covered by the capital resources identified in the capital programme. The impact on the Unitary Charge relates to the charges for facilities management; the increase will be covered by a corresponding increase in the school’s contribution arising from the larger floor area and increased pupil numbers that are funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant. Any other adjustments are covered by the annual review of the affordability gap across the whole PFI contract.

6.4 The revenue costs for both schemes i.e. teaching and property will be covered by the Dedicated Schools Grant through the individual schools budget driven by the increase in pupil numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current year</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs: Castle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs: Upton</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded by</td>
<td>NCC Discretionary Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**On-going costs (revenue)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs - Staffing</th>
<th>Current year</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Financing costs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total on-going costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded by</td>
<td>Corporate Treasury Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*2013-14 cost only. Financing costs are charged over the asset life as c £200k a year inclusive of interest and MRP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Costs (capital & revenue) | 190 | 3973 | 477 | 218 |

What benefits will the proposal deliver? Provide additional school places to meet the growth in demand

7. Risk and Business Continuity Management

a) Risk(s) associated with the proposal
Risk Mitigation Residual Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Residual Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public support for the proposals</td>
<td>Only one objection received during the public consultations.</td>
<td>Amber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town planning issues</td>
<td>Extensive consultation on building design planned</td>
<td>Amber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse impact on other schools</td>
<td>Unlikely as population growth in both areas.</td>
<td>Amber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Risk(s) associated with not undertaking the proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council will be unable to meet its statutory duty to provide school places</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible costs of transporting children to other schools</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. List of Appendices

Appendix 1: Consultation Letters
Appendix 2: Responses received to the consultation

Author: Name: Alan Fitz
Team: Strategic Planning
Contact details: Tel: 01604 237702 Fax: 01604 236372
Email: afitz@northamptonshire.gov.uk

Background Papers:
Cabinet Reports
August 2010 Item E2 Monthly Capital Programme
October 2010 Item B2
January 2011 Item A3

Does the report propose a key decision is taken? YES
If yes, is the decision in the Forward Plan? YES
Will further decisions be required? If so, please outline the timetable here NO
Is this report proposing an amendment to the budget and/or policy framework? NO
Have the financial implications been cleared by the Strategic Finance Manager (SFM)? YES
Name of SFM: Jon Lee (revenue) and Glenn Hammons (capital)
Have any capital spend implications been cleared by the Operational Management Team (OMT)?
Has the report been cleared by the relevant Corporate Director or ACE? YES
Name of Director: Paul Burnett
Has the relevant Cabinet Member been consulted? YES
Cabinet Member: Andrew Grant
Has the relevant scrutiny committee been consulted? NO
Scrutiny Committee: Children & Young People’s Service
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has the report been cleared by Legal Services?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of solicitor:</td>
<td>Shahin Ismail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitor's comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have any communications issues been cleared by Communications and Marketing?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of officer:</td>
<td>Eva Duffy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have any property issues been cleared by Property and Asset Management?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of officer:</td>
<td>John Pardoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has an Equalities Impact Assessment been carried out in relation to this report?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/en/councilservices/Community/equalities/Pages/CYP-EIA.aspx">http://www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/en/councilservices/Community/equalities/Pages/CYP-EIA.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any community safety implications?</td>
<td>None anticipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any environmental implications:</td>
<td>The new buildings are designed to meet the current environmental standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any Health &amp; Safety Implications:</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building work will be carried out in line with health and safety regulations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any Human Resources Implications:</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending schools will require the employment of additional teaching and non-teaching staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any human rights implications:</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituency Interest:</td>
<td>Castle Proposal = Tony Clarke, Castle; Winston Strachan, St Crispin; Richard Church, Kingsley Upton Meadows Proposal = David Hugheston-Roberts, East Hunsbury; Don Edwards, Old Duston; Suresh Patel, St James</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Review

Notes Arising

Date/Time: 14th July 2011

Location: County Hall

Project Title: Northampton Primary School Expansions

GTC Tender No: D6264

1.0 Introductions /apologies

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roy Horsfall</td>
<td>RDH</td>
<td>GTC Bid Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan Parnell</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>GHMRT Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Mainwaring</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>GHMRT Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Ringwood</td>
<td>KR</td>
<td>NCC Capital Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Spurrel</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>NCC Project Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Moor</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>NCC Principle Development Control Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PA: Planning Application
## 2.0 General Planning

| PM | Concern that extensions will not look like a portakabin  
All reassured him that was the specific objective, system built, panelised, common components and design, limited pallet of envelope treatments but not looking or feeling temporary. |
| PM | Key driver to be ‘in keeping’ - Doesn’t like Western Red Cedar (WRC) |
| RP LM | Various sample renders of the projects were tabled for review.  
Discussion regarding mix of materials limiting range of materials with variation in colours to give identity.  
Learning from past experience (Note Amey/Amber) and addressing background to concern;  
- Location  
- Material Choice  
- Detailing  
Suggestion of Brick to Gables, panels system possibly timber (not WRC) to front (window elevation). |
| KR | Schools have a concern that blocks should feel part of the school not a stand alone structure unique and separated from the whole. |
| PM | PA will be dealt with dependent on nature and volume of letters received during public consultation period 3 Weeks.  
Kingsthorpe definitely committee.  
Committee Dates to be forwarded. |
| PM | **Environmental** need to be spoken to they have recently thrown in ‘curve balls’  
Speak to Tina Cuss  
*Refer to previous note re previous surveys carried out.* |
| PM | An NCC contact list was handed over |
| PM | **Archaeology** – Castle and Kingsthorpe particularly sensitive  
Pass all 6 past for their view – contact Lesley-Ann Mather / Liz Mordew |
| PM | Tree removal – *(LW)* Like for like replacement?  
*(PM)* Accept removal if poor quality or essential but prefer retention.  
There must be a clear justification of action. |
<p>| PM | Need to include indicative Construction Management Plan; Contractors compound and access route into the PA to inform the consultation process. Needs to be within the ‘redline’ extent of the planning permission – note this is to be kept below the trigger area for a FRA. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Will inform planning conditions applied in terms of hours of work, constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Public consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public meeting to be held Monday 18th at Kingsthorpe Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(PM) refer in PA. Each Application should outline the case for the expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Planning consultation may result in changes being necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key statutory consultations need to be resolved for successful PA – note particularly Sport England is a Technical Consultee and an outstanding condition would not be accepted by planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Each Application in A4 format with 2 sets of full size drawings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR</td>
<td>106 Agreement – (PM) general principle is that the authority doesn’t like to enter into them with themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.0 Castle

| PM | Archaeology- listed structures, wall at front and either side |
| KR | Area of build is made ground? From the previous work done on the site |
|    | What was done previously – work in area of extension? Is it infill? GT |
|    | (PM) inform Archaeology department of those works done to build are previously |
| PM | Note on PA that existing mobile removed |
|    | Cycle racks replaced – note currently extensive |
|    | In PFI there is provision for future extension should demand require it. |

### 4.0 Kings Heath

| LW | (LW) 2 trees to be removed, 1 large poor condition adjacent to H play. 1 small adj building. |
| KP | Archaeology – referred to as Kings Heath Park, was previously open now fenced. (PM) Lot of Archaeology locally – refer for advice |
| PM | Check and confirm parking |
### 5.0 Kingsley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KR</th>
<th>Raeburn site – declassified as surplus (cabinet approval in September) and increase area of School. Possible incorporate demo into scheme – Community use application been made, condition survey by property department awaited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demo will not be within this application. Discussion Open top teaching area – (KR) Schools like this HT consultation with yr6 use of space way of promoting trust and rewarding behaviour. (PM) needs to be sensitively treated and labelled / Statement to confirm supervised teaching area. (LM/RP) Building moved away from boundary and terrace screened. (KR) School request timber barrier not ‘horrible’ metal one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.0 Standens Barn

| PM | Discuss building relocated to avoid trees, Gang mower can now get around. Additional car park as drawn to be reduced. Semi rural situation. Consideration to be given to context and link with environment rather than generic solutions built to date. |

### 7.0 Kingsthorpe Village

| PM | Highlight in PA reason for selection of location Alternatives considered; |
|    | By Church                                                                 |
|    | - Listed building                                                                 |
|    | - Construction Access                                                            |
|    | - Trees                                                                 |
|    | - Topography                                                                      |
|    | - Link to school                                                                  |
|    | Front of School on MUGA                                                          |
|    | - Elevated over neighbouring gardens                                            |
|    | - Would require reconfiguration of the School                                   |
|    | - Extension and reconfiguration of the airlock                                  |
|    | PM | Noted significant local interest                                               |
|    | - Jump in capacity                                                              |
|    | - Sport England not supportive – how is this to be addressed                    |
|    | - Traffic                                                                      |
PM  Kingsthorpe will be a committee item
Could exceed the 13 week time frame if pursued in light of significant opposition
Committee expect October / November assuming it meets all requirements
Public consultation 3 weeks

LW  Traffic assessment suggests limited impact

KR  Meeting 18/07 invited Highways to attend now at Director level. The traffic issues are not necessarily School related.

Points to note
Kingsthorpe Village – Birthrate risen by 30%+
Demand such that School unable to offer places to local children living <1/2 mile away
May cease to be viable

LW  Access could be improved by additional pedestrian access

RP

8.0  Cabinet

KR  Time table
Cabinet date - September 13th
Deadline for submission – August 18th
Sign off at Director Level – 11th August
Submission to Director – 3rd August*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15/07/11</td>
<td>Cabinet Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/07/11</td>
<td>Deadline for submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/11</td>
<td>Sign off at Director Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd August</td>
<td>Submission to Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NCC will take planning risk,
Provisional sums with be permissible within agreed parameters
*Amey and NSL inputs required
Next weeks cabinet capital investment board will confirm permission to proceed but budget needs to be more robust.

KR  Best Value
GT Figures benchmarked against past projects
Rowan

I have had some informal pre-application correspondence and most usefully further plans and photos sent by Bryan from Lockhart Garratt. I now have a better understanding of the sites and the trees and landscaping to be removed or impacted by the proposed development.

Beyond breeding bird surveys of buildings, trees or hedges/shrubs to be affected or commitments/proposals to undertake clearance works between September and February only, I don’t believe there are likely to be any significant negative impacts on ecology or biodiversity habitats. Therefore ecology reports will not be necessary. However, could you please confirm no buildings are being demolished or roofs altered as part of the proposals? (The potential for impact here might be bats).

Regards
Tina Cuss
Senior Environmental Planner
Planning Services
Northamptonshire County Council
01604 236705

From: Rowan Parnell [mailto:rowan.parnell@ghm-group.co.uk]
Sent: 18 July 2011 17:51
To: Tina Cuss
Cc: Peter Moor; london emails
Subject: Northampton Schools expansion_Ecology

Tina,

I have been given your contact details by Peter Moor, Northamptonshire planning officer, and am working with Northamptonshire County Council on applying for planning permission for six extensions at primary schools in Northampton.

Please could you advise if any ecological surveys, etc, would be required to accompany the planning submissions for these six proposed extensions.

The schools where extensions are proposed are:

:: **Kingsley Primary school**
   (1 form entry school – to be expanded into 2 form entry school)

:: **Kingsthorpe Village Primary School**
   (1 form entry school – to be expanded into 2 form entry school)

:: **Briar Hill Primary School**
   (1.5 form entry school – to be expanded into 2 form entry school)

:: **Standen’s Barn Primary School**
   (1.5 form entry school – to be expanded into 2 form entry school)

:: **Castle Primary School**
For your information, please find attached to this email some pages from our feasibility studies for the expansion of the schools (including site addresses).

Thank you very much for your assistance. If you require any further information please contact me.

Regards,

Rowan Parnell
Architect

GHM Rock Townsend
The Old School
Exton Street
London SE1 8UE
T: 020 7261 9577

www.ghm-group.co.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

GHM Consultancy Group Ltd. Registered in England No. 1865927
Registered Office: Wheathampstead Place, Wheathampstead, Hertfordshire, AL4 8SB

This e-mail is subject to our Legal Notice which you can view here.

This message has been scanned by MailController.
Consultation Information

Arboriculture
Bryan

I don’t know whether he would normally comment on County Council planning applications but I wondered whether Ian Wright from the Borough Council would have any advice or views on replacement trees on some of these sites? I don’t know if they would have a list of recommended species. Our Landscape Guidelines don’t cover urban areas and it’s not an area I’ve dealt with that much, so more familiar with specifying the native spp than ornamentals.

Regards
Tina Cuss
Senior Environmental Planner
Planning Services
Northamptonshire County Council
01604 236705

From: Bryan Clary [mailto:Bryan.Clary@lockhart-garratt.co.uk]
Sent: 19 July 2011 17:00
To: Tina Cuss
Cc: Marie Allcoat
Subject: Northampton Schools: Castle Primary Tree Information (3526 D01)

Hi Tina

If you remember a couple of weeks ago I spoke to you about a number of school sites that have been highlighted for new teaching blocks. There were six in total. I’ve now visited the sites and have got the information we discussed (Tree Schedule, Tree Constraints Plan and Arboricultural Implications Plan). If you remember I was going to collect this baseline information and then report back to you to see what further information would be satisfactory through planning as many of the sites didn’t have many trees.

For your information I have since spoken to the architects and on some sites I have been successful and have managed to move the footprint of the new teaching block and some of the hardstanding away from retained trees.

Please find attached the Tree Schedule and plans for Castle Primary School.

Castle Primary information

An area which is soft landscaped at present will have a new teaching block on it. The current hardlandscape area to the east will be soft landscaped with a number of trees (I have been tasked with specifying replacement trees so that is a discussion we can also have).

As a result of the teaching block there will be three direct tree removals (T2, T4 and T5) and one indirect removal (T3) due mainly to its poor location.

- T2 ash – reasonable condition (although defect in main stem) but has to be removed to facilitate the development.
- T3 ash – growing under wall. Remove as part of good arboricultural management.
- T4 and T5 cherry – young specimens, easily replaced.
Tree protection

T1 (small cherry) could easily be replaced, but also could easily be retained through fencing.

If you could look over the plans and schedule I will contact you tomorrow to discuss if a full AIA is required for this site, a brief document and/or a planting specification for replacement trees.

Many thanks

Bryan Clary
Arboricultural Consultant

LOCKHART GARRATT LTD

For up to date news and information, follow us on Twitter! www.twitter.com/LockhartGarratt

8 Melbourne House, CorbyGate Business Park
Weldon, Corby, Northants, NN17 5JG

Tel: 01536 408840 Fax: 01536 408860

bryan.clary@lockhart-garratt.co.uk

www.lockhart-garratt.co.uk

Registered Number: 3544434

This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure.

It is strictly prohibited to disseminate, distribute or copy this communication if you are not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering the message. If you have received this communication in error, please accept our apologies. Please telephone the sender on the above number or email them by return

This email has been scanned by Webroot for the presence of known Viruses and Spam - Powered by TekNet Solutions Ltd (www.teknet.co.uk).
Rowan Parnell

From: Tina Cuss [TCuss@northamptonshire.gov.uk]
Sent: 22 July 2011 15:32
To: Bryan Clary
Subject: RE: Northampton Schools: Castle Primary Tree Information (3526 D01)

Bryan

I am happy with the level of information provided and that a full AIA is not needed on this site. It would be useful to agree the replacement species and have an understanding of where there will be space for them so that they can be retained for the long term (as the site is so tight/small).

Regards
Tina Cuss
Senior Environmental Planner
Planning Services
Northamptonshire County Council
01604 236705

From: Bryan Clary [mailto:Bryan.Clary@lockhart-garratt.co.uk]
Sent: 19 July 2011 17:00
To: Tina Cuss
Cc: Marie Allcoat
Subject: Northampton Schools: Castle Primary Tree Information (3526 D01)

Hi Tina

If you remember a couple of weeks ago I spoke to you about a number of school sites that have been highlighted for new teaching blocks. There were six in total. I’ve now visited the sites and have got the information we discussed (Tree Schedule, Tree Constraints Plan and Arboricultural Implications Plan). If you remember I was going to collect this baseline information and then report back to you to see what further information would be satisfactory through planning as many of the sites didn’t have many trees.

For your information I have since spoken to the architects and on some sites I have been successful and have managed to move the footprint of the new teaching block and some of the hardstanding away from retained trees.

Please find attached the Tree Schedule and plans for Castle Primary School.

**Castle Primary information**

An area which is soft landscaped at present will have a new teaching block on it. The current hardlandscape area to the east will be soft landscaped with a number of trees (I have been tasked with specifying replacement trees so that is a discussion we can also have).

As a result of the teaching block there will be three direct tree removals (T2, T4 and T5) and one indirect removal (T3) due mainly to its poor location.

- T2 ash – reasonable condition (although defect in main stem) but has to be removed to facilitate the development.
- T3 ash – growing under wall. Remove as part of good arboricultural management.
- T4 and T5 cherry – young specimens, easily replaced.

**Tree protection**
T1 (small cherry) could easily be replaced, but also could easily be retained through fencing.

If you could look over the plans and schedule I will contact you tomorrow to discuss if a full AIA is required for this site, a brief document and/or a planting specification for replacement trees.

Many thanks

Bryan Clary

Arboricultural Consultant

LOCKHART GARRATT LTD

For up to date news and information, follow us on Twitter! www.twitter.com/LockhartGarratt

8 Melbourne House, CorbyGate Business Park

Weldon, Corby, Northants, NN17 5JG

Tel: 01536 408840  Fax: 01536 408860

bryan.clary@lockhart-garratt.co.uk

www.lockhart-garratt.co.uk

Registered Number: 3544434

This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure.

It is strictly prohibited to disseminate, distribute or copy this communication if you are not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering the message. If you have received this communication in error, please accept our apologies. Please telephone the sender on the above number or email them by return.
Rowan Parnell  
GHM Rock Townsend  
By e-mail  
rowan.parnell@ghm-group.co.uk  

05 August 2011  
Our Ref: EM/NRC/2011/24498/P  

Dear Rowan  

Site Address: Castle Primary School  
St Georges Street  
Northampton NN1 2TR  

Proposal:  

Thank you for consulting Sport England on your proposal.  

General  

Sport England considers proposals affecting playing fields in the light of its  
This is available online at:  
http://www.sportengland.org/facilities__planning/putting_policy_into_practice/
playing_fields.aspx  

This policy statement defines in planning terms what is considered a ‘Playing  
Pitch’, which is; the whole of a site that encompasses at least one playing  
pitch. A playing pitch is a delineated area, which together with any run off is of  
0.2 hectares or more.  

The aim of this policy is to ensure that there is an adequate supply of quality  
pitches to satisfy the current and estimated future demands of the pitch  
sports. The policy identifies five exceptions to our normal position of opposing  
development, which would result in the loss of playing fields. These may be  
summarised as follows:
E1 A documented assessment of current and future needs has demonstrated that there is an excess of playing fields in the catchment.

E2 The proposed development is ancillary to the main use of a site for playing fields.

E3 The development affects only land incapable of forming a, or part of a, playing pitch.

E4 The playing fields to be lost would be replaced by a playing field of equivalent or better quality.

E5 The proposed development is for a sports facility, the benefit of which would outweigh the harm caused by the loss of a playing field.

It is planned to construct a stand alone teaching block at Castle Primary School. The proposed classroom block would be constructed on an informal grassed area, which is separate to the main playing field area. Sport England would support the provision of a new classroom block in this location.

If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours sincerely

Steve Beard
Dear Mr Parnell

Northampton Schools expansion_FRA

Thank you for your email of 18 July 2011.

We can confirm that all of the primary schools lie in an area of ‘low’ flood probability as defined in Table D1 of Planning Policy Statement 25 ‘Development and Flood Risk’ (PPS 25) known as Flood Zone 1. All of the primary school sites are also outside of any critical drainage areas, as shown in Figure F-1 of the Northampton Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, dated February 2010.

As the red line boundaries for all of the primary schools are less than one hectare the school sites can all be categorised as ‘operational development of greater than 1 hectare in size falling within Flood Zone 1’, as stated in our Flood Risk Standing Advice (FRSA).

FRSA is a series of standard comments for local planning authorities and planning applicants to refer to on ‘lower risk’ development proposals where flood risk is an issue to replace direct case by case consultation with us and can be viewed on our web site at www.environment-agency.gov.uk. These sites sit within this category. The FRSA which applies to this application falls under F5 of the Standing Advice Matrix. The advice relevant to this application is attached for your convenience.

This advice relates solely to flood risk. However, our advice has not considered the risk of flooding from other sources, such as groundwater, drainage systems, reservoirs, canals or ordinary watercourses. Please note that this advice is given in good faith on the basis of the information supplied at the time of writing. This advice is given without prejudice to matters that may arise from further information, consultation or examination and is therefore not binding on any formal consultation reply or decision that may be made by the Environment Agency.

Cont/d..
Should you require any additional information, or wish to discuss these matters further, please do not hesitate to contact me on the number below.

Yours sincerely

John O'Neill  
Planning Liaison Officer

Direct dial 01536 385116  
Direct fax 01536 411354  
Direct e-mail john-edward.oneill@environment-agency.gov.uk
Dear Natasha and Ruth,

We refer to our telephone conversation earlier today with respect of soil information required for planning purposes. As discussed, planning application is due to be submitted for this development shortly.

We have been appointed by Galliford Try Construction (GTC) to provide structural and civil engineering design services for the above project.

As requested, we confirm that we have arranged to hand deliver a cd to your Westbridge Depot Offices (Northampton) containing Proposed Site Plan, previous Soil Investigation Reports and Planning Information for previous works for your review in relation to the proposed works. This will be hand delivered by around 4pm.

We would appreciate if you can advise by return if the attached information would be sufficient for planning purposes and/or otherwise what other information will be required.

We will appreciate your prompt response.

Kind regards,

Hitesh Jethwa
for & behalf of DAVID SMITH ASSOCIATES T: 01604 782 620 F: 01604 782 629

This message has been scanned by MailController.
Dear Natasha,

Thank you for your e-mail below.

Below is a summary of information that we have extracted from the SI Reports of various schools to assist you with your review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Contamination Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley Primary School</td>
<td>Contamination Identified and greater than allowable levels. However, Short Term Risk to Construction workers can be mitigated by Risk Assessment and use of appropriate PPE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsthorpe Village Primary School</td>
<td>Contamination Identified and greater than allowable levels. However, Short Term Risk to Construction workers can be mitigated by Risk Assessment and use of appropriate PPE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briar Hill Primary School</td>
<td>Contamination Identified and greater than allowable levels. However, Short Term Risk to Construction workers can be mitigated by Risk Assessment and use of appropriate PPE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standens Barn Primary School</td>
<td>Contamination Identified and greater than allowable levels. However, Short Term Risk to Construction workers can be mitigated by Risk Assessment and use of appropriate PPE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Primary School</td>
<td>No contamination found in the previous investigations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Heath Primary School</td>
<td>No Contamination Test Results provided in the previous investigations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We trust the above will assist you in providing a quicker response.

Kind regards,

Hitesh Jethwa
for & behalf of DAVID SMITH ASSOCIATES T: 01604 782 620 F: 01604 782 629

---

From: Natasha Stanley [mailto:nstanley@northampton.gov.uk]
Sent: 03 August 2011 13:36
To: HiteshJethwa@DSAGroup.co.uk
Subject: RE: Northampton Schools Extensions
Hello Hitesh

We are very busy at the moment, so we are not likely to be able to provide a fast turn around to the information recently sent to us.

There is also quite a lot of information provided on the CD to be reviewed.

If you are waiting to submit a planning application, please don't delay while you wait for us to respond. We will come back to you as soon as we have had a chance to look at the data provided.

Best regards

Natasha Stanley
Senior Environmental Health Officer
Northampton Borough Council
Tel: 01604 837772 dd

Westbridge Depot
St James Mill Road
Northampton
NN5 5JW
Fax 01604 838755

From: Hitesh Jethwa [mailto:HiteshJethwa@DSAGroup.co.uk]
Sent: 28 July 2011 15:04
To: Natasha Stanley; Ruth Austen
Cc: 'Roy Horsfall (Galliford Try)'; 'Justin Milne (Galliford Try)'; Rowan.Parnell@GHM-Group.co.uk; DSALogin@DSAGroup.co.uk
Subject: FW: Northampton Schools Extensions

Dear Natasha and Ruth,

We refer to our telephone conversation earlier today with respect of soil information required for planning purposes. As discussed, planning application is due to be submitted for this development shortly.

We have been appointed by Galliford Try Construction (GTC) to provide structural and civil engineering design services for the above project.

As requested, we confirm that we have arranged to hand deliver a CD to your Westbridge Depot Offices (Northampton) containing Proposed Site Plan, previous Soil Investigation Reports and Planning Information for previous works for your review in relation to the proposed works. This will be hand delivered by around 4pm.

We would appreciate if you can advise by return if the attached information would be sufficient for planning purposes and/or otherwise what other information will be required.

We will appreciate your prompt response.

Kind regards,

Hitesh Jethwa
Please note that the contents of this e-mail, including any attachments thereto, may contain information which is confidential or privileged, and which is solely for the use of the recipient named above. The information contained in this e-mail, and in your reply, may be subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or other legislation, and its confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Northampton Borough Council, The Guildhall, Northampton, United Kingdom, NN1 1DE +44 (0)300 330 7000 www.northampton.gov.uk
Dear All,

Please find attached response from Ruth Austen.

Kind regards,

Hitesh Jethwa
for & behalf of DAVID SMITH ASSOCIATES T: 01604 782 620 F: 01604 782 629

---

From: Ruth Austen [mailto:rausten@northampton.gov.uk]
Sent: 04 August 2011 14:59
To: HiteshJethwa@DSAGroup.co.uk
Cc: Natasha Stanley
Subject: school sites

Dear Hitesh,

I have now had a look through the reports. I can confirm that although the reports are somewhat out of date their general conclusions are satisfactory. It is not anticipated that any further investigations would be required prior to submitting any planning applications. However it is likely that any consent would be subject to conditions requiring risk assessment in respect to the impact of any contamination on the specific proposals or if the initial report do not indicate the presence of contamination that any unsuspected contamination is dealt with in an appropriate manner.

If you need any clarification please let me know.

Yours sincerely

Ruth Austen
Environmental Health Manager
Environmental Protection
Regulatory Services
Northampton Borough Council
Westbridge Depot
St James Mill Road
Northampton
NN5 5JW

phone 01604 837794
e-mail: rausten@northampton.gov.uk

Please note that the contents of this e-mail, including any attachments thereto, may contain information which is confidential or privileged, and which is solely for the use of the recipient named above. The information contained in this e-mail, and in your reply, may be subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or other legislation, and its confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. If you are not the
Consultation Information

Secured by design
I am still waiting for the crime context information from the analyst. I have been promised it by the end of this week. When I have received it I will contact you with my recommendations.

Sharon

Sharon Henley | Crime Prevention Design Adviser (Covering Northampton South and Central, South Northants and Daventry District) | Community Safety team, 03000 111 222 | Ext 8224 | Mobile 07799 786507 | Fax 01327 303284
sharon.henley@northants.pnn.police.uk
Towcester Police Station, Watling Street, Towcester, Northamptonshire, NN12 6DE
Northamptonshire Police: Putting Communities First

I just wanted to catch up and see if you have had a chance to look over the six school sites as of yet?

Thank you.

Regards,

Rowan Parnell
Architect

GHM Rock Townsend
The Old School
Exton Street
London SE1 8UE

T: 020 7261 9577

www.ghm-group.co.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

GHM Consultancy Group Ltd. Registered in England No. 1865927
Registered Office: Wheathampstead Place, Wheathampstead, Hertfordshire, AL4 8SB

This e-mail is subject to our Legal Notice which you can view here.
Thank you for your e-mail. I have requested crime context information on each of the sites and immediate surroundings and once I have received that I shall be back in touch with any recommendations I may have site by site.

Sharon

Sharon Henley | Crime Prevention Design Adviser (Covering Northampton South and Central, South Northants and Daventry District) | Community Safety team, 03000 111 222 | Ext 8224 | Mobile 07799 786507 | Fax 01327 303284 sharon.henley@northants.pnn.police.uk
Towcester Police Station, Watling Street, Towcester, Northamptonshire, NN12 6DE
Northamptonshire Police: Putting Communities First

---

From: Rowan Parnell [mailto:rowan.parnell@ghm-group.co.uk]
Sent: 18 July 2011 17:36
To: Henley Sharon
Cc: Peter Moor; london emails
Subject: Northampton Schools expansion

Sharon,

I have been given your contact details by Peter Moor, Northamptonshire planning officer, and am working with Northamptonshire County Council on applying for planning permission for six extensions at primary schools in Northampton.

We will attempt to address/design the buildings to the principles of Secured By Design. Please could you advise of any further recommendations/comments with regards to these six proposed extensions on these sites specific school sites.

The schools where extensions are proposed are:

:: **Kingsley Primary school**
(1 form entry school – to be expanded into 2 form entry school)

:: **Kingsthorpe Village Primary School**
(1 form entry school – to be expanded into 2 form entry school)

:: **Briar Hill Primary School**
(1.5 form entry school – to be expanded into 2 form entry school)

:: **Standen’s Barn Primary School**
(1.5 form entry school – to be expanded into 2 form entry school)

:: **Castle Primary School**
(1.5 form entry school +nursery – to be expanded into 2 form entry school +nursery)

:: **Kings Heath Primary School**
(1.5 form entry school +nursery – to be expanded into 2 form entry school +nursery)

For your information, please find attached to this email some pages from our feasibility studies for the expansion of the schools (including site addresses).

Thank you very much for your assistance. If you require any further information please contact me.

Regards,

Rowan Parnell
Architect
Please consider the environment before printing this email.

GHM Consultancy Group Ltd. Registered in England No. 1865927
Registered Office: Wheathampstead Place, Wheathampstead, Hertfordshire, AL4 8SB

This e-mail is subject to our Legal Notice which you can view here.
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Consultation Information

Highways
Further to our conversation earlier today I can confirm that for all the proposals below a Transport Statement will be sufficient to support any proposed planning applications.

Regards

Mick Tilley
Principal Engineer Development Management

From: Peter Kelly [mailto:peterkelly@bcal.co.uk]
Sent: 20 May 2011 10:09
To: Mick Tilley
Subject: RE: E4164 Northampton Primary schools

Mick

As discussed.

Details of pupil & staff numbers at each school:

:: Kingsley Primary school
(1 form entry school - to be expanded into 2 form entry school | 210 pupils increased to 420 pupils, approx.15 additional staff)

:: Kingsthorpe Village Primary School
(1 form entry school - to be expanded into 2 form entry school | 210 pupils increased to 420 pupils, approx.15 additional staff)

:: Briar Hill Primary School
(1.5 form entry school – to be expanded into 2 form entry school | 315 pupils increased to 420 pupils, approx. 7 additional staff)

:: Standen’s Barn Primary School

(1.5 form entry school – to be expanded into 2 form entry school | 315 pupils increased to 420 pupils, approx. 7 additional staff)

:: Castle Primary School

(1.5 form entry school + nursery – to be expanded into 2 form entry school + nursery | 315 pupils + nursery increased to 420 pupils + nursery, approx. 7 additional staff)

:: Kings Heath Primary School

(1.5 form entry school + nursery – to be expanded into 2 form entry school + nursery | 315 pupils + nursery increased to 420 pupils + nursery pupils, approx. 7 additional staff)

Regards

Peter Kelly

BCALCONSULTING

Orient House | Church Way | Wellingborough | Northamptonshire | NN8 4HJ

Telephone: 01933 440024    Fax: 01933 440041    E-Mail:  peterkelly@bcal.co.uk
Web:  http://www.bcal.co.uk/  www.bcal.co.uk

Brian Cole Associates Limited trading as BCAL CONSULTING.
Registered in England No 2222380 at Orient House, Church Way, Wellingborough, NN8 4HJ
The contents and any attachments of this e-mail are confidential and intended for use for the named addresses only. Any other use of the message or attachments by unauthorised person(s) is strictly prohibited, unless stated to the contrary.

BCAL CONSULTING is not responsible for changes made to this e-mail after it has been sent.

Please note that this e-mail and any attachments have been checked for viruses, however it is possible that viruses can still be transmitted or downloaded via e-mail.

BCAL CONSULTING disclaim all responsibility for any viruses which arise directly or indirectly from this transmission.

-------------------------------------------------
This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or organisation to whom they are addressed. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender either by return of e-mail or by ringing the County Council's main switchboard on (0)1604 236236.

The information contained in this e-mail and in your reply may be subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or other legislation and its confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

This e-mail has been checked for the presence of computer viruses.
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Consultation Information

Archaeology
Rowan Parnell

From: Lesley-Ann Mather [LMather@northamptonshire.gov.uk]
Sent: 03 August 2011 16:01
To: Rowan Parnell
Subject: Northampton Schools expansion_Archaeology

Rowan

:: Kingsley Primary school
(1 form entry school – to be expanded into 2 form entry school) **Condition**

The school sits within an area that has not been subject to recent archaeological investigation however a number of find spots have been identified during building works including a Neolithic axe, unsatisfied Palaeolithic finds and scattered finds to the north. The archaeological potential of the area is unclear and as such I would suggest that observation and recording is undertaken if permission was granted.

:: Kingsthorpe Village Primary School
(1 form entry school – to be expanded into 2 form entry school) **Evaluation (intrusive ) in advance**

The archaeological potential of the site was considered within a Desk Based Assessment produced in 2004 by the Museum of London Museum Service. This identifies that the school lies within the vicinity of a former medieval manor. During construction some medieval activity was identified and this activity could potentially extend into the development area. The DBA also indicated that some levelling may have taken place within the application area however the extent of this is unclear. The evaluation will identify if any remains are present within the development area and provide information on their extent and significance.

:: Briar Hill Primary School
(1.5 form entry school – to be expanded into 2 form entry school) **Condition**

The school sits within an area that has not been subject to recent archaeological investigation however the Historic Environment Record indicates that the school lies to the south of a large Iron Age enclosure. The site is also adjacent to a Neolithic causewayed enclosure. The proposed development lies within a landscape rich in archaeological activity and as such there is a high possibility that archaeological activity maybe present within the development area.

:: Standen’s Barn Primary School
(1.5 form entry school – to be expanded into 2 form entry school) **Condition**

The school sits within an area that has not been subject to archaeological investigation however the Historic Environment Record indicates a number of Roman pottery sherds have been identified in the area to the east of the School. The proposed development therefore has the potential to contain as yet undiscovered remains possibly associated with the Roman period.

:: Castle Primary School
(1.5 form entry school +nursery – to be expanded into 2 form entry school +nursery) **Evaluation (intrusive) in advance In light of geotechnical information changed to condition**

An archaeological watching brief was undertaken between May and July 2006 during groundworks connected with the construction of a new school building to the west of the proposed new building on the site. This identified that parts of the site had been truncated as is highlighted within the geotechnical reports provided. The watching brief identified no archaeological deposits during the construction of the new school block to the west. However the proposed works are within an area that has not been subject to as much disturbance as part of the original school scheme. I have assessed the geotechnical information that you have provided. It is unfortunate that none of the pits were in the location of the proposed new build. However looking at the information within TH6 and TH5 I would suggest that it would be better bearing in mind the depth at which possible archaeology may commence, the limits regarding depth of hand of excavation and the indications within TH06 of truncation to undertake the evaluation process post
determination. I would advise that any investigation work was undertaken as soon as possible after permission was granted.

:: Kings Heath Primary School
(1.5 form entry school +nursery – to be expanded into 2 form entry school +nursery) **Evaluation (intrusive) in advance**

The school sits within an area that has not been subject to recent archaeological investigation however the Historic Environment Record indicates that the school grounds have a find spot representing possible Saxon or medieval activity. The proposed development lies within a landscape rich in archaeological activity containing a Neolithic causewayed enclosure and an extensive Iron Age settlement. There is therefore a high possibility that archaeological activity maybe present within the development area.

I hope this is what you wanted.

Please feel free to cut and paste.

Regards

Lesley-Ann

---

Lesley-Ann Mather
County Archaeological Advisor
01604 237909

This message has been scanned by MailController.

---

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or organisation to whom they are addressed. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender either by return of e-mail or by ringing the County Council's main switchboard on (0)1604 236236. The information contained in this e-mail and in your reply may be subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or other legislation and its confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. This e-mail has been checked for the presence of computer viruses. Northamptonshire County Council. http://www.northamptonshire.gov.uk
Ground Preparation for replacement trees

Tree Planting

Aftercare and Maintenance

Legend:
- Individual tree crown spread
- Tree category and root protection areas
  - Category A: High retention and value
  - Category B: Moderate retention and value
  - Category C: Low retention and value
  - Category R: Remove
- NB: Group canopy spreads are drawn approximately
- Protective fending

Replacement Trees

Tree
- Ref. T1: Betula pendula
- Ref. T2: Platanus × hispanica
- Ref. T3: Fraxinus pendula
- Ref. T4: Platanus × acerifolia

Legend:
- Individual tree crown spread
- Tree category and root protection areas
  - Category A: High retention and value
  - Category B: Moderate retention and value
  - Category C: Low retention and value
  - Category R: Remove
- NB: Group canopy spreads are drawn approximately
- Protective fending

Tree species
- Betula pendula
- Platanus × hispanica
- Fraxinus pendula
- Platanus × acerifolia

Specification
- Container

Type
- 12-14

All areas to be kept weed free and ornamental mulch is to be topped up as required to maintain a uniform depth of 50mm. All losses are to be replaced with the same species to maintain the original design. Tree ties are to be periodically loosened to accommodate tree growth and prevent restriction or abrasion.
### BS5837:2005 Tree Schedule

**Client:** Galliford Try Ltd  
**Site:** Castle Primary School  
**Surveyor:** Bryan Clary  
**Survey Date:** 1st July 2011

#### Trees identified for removal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree No.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
<th>Stem Dia (mm)</th>
<th>Crown Spread (m)</th>
<th>Height of Crown Clearance (m)</th>
<th>Age Class</th>
<th>Phys Con</th>
<th>Struc Con</th>
<th>Additional notes</th>
<th>Preliminary management recommendations</th>
<th>Action agreed with Northants County Council</th>
<th>Estimated remaining contribution (Years)</th>
<th>Ref Cat</th>
<th>RPA Radius (m)</th>
<th>RPA Area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Flowering cherry (Prunus species)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Mid Good</td>
<td>Good Ground compacted around the base of the tree as a result from children playing. Small diameter surface roots are evident. Short stature with a vase like form. Specimen is unlikely to grow significantly larger.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Tree protection if retained. Option for removal.</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mid Good</td>
<td>Fair Unusual basal formation that is elongated east to west. The main stem has a partially occluded wound at 1.5m south with significant swelling. Main stem slightly leans to south although the crown is weighted to the west. Evidence of previous crown raising in the lower crown. Epicormic growth on main stem from 3m. Overall reasonable.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Fall to facilitate development.</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>117.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mid Poor</td>
<td>Poor Located directly adjacent to the boundary brick wall. Wound at base of tree around half of it's circumference. Upper crown exhibits dieback and recent deadwood. Poor quality, in terminal decline and is liable cause future damage to the adjacent wall.</td>
<td>Fell.</td>
<td>Fall due to poor condition.</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Flowering cherry (Prunus species)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mid Good</td>
<td>Good Main stem forks at 2m. Short stature with a vase like form.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Fall to facilitate development.</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Flowering cherry (Prunus species)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yng Good</td>
<td>Good Main stem forks at 2m. Staked and tie in position. Vase like form. Likely to have been planted at the same time as the other adjacent cherry but it has very slow rate of growth. Leader has been pruned/removed. Unlikely to improve in the future, low quality.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Fall to facilitate development.</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6</td>
<td>Group of: Silver birch (Betula pendula) Ash (Fraxinus excelsior) Wild cherry (Prunus avium)</td>
<td>up to 15</td>
<td>up to 250</td>
<td>av dia 6</td>
<td>2 Mid Fair to Good</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
<td>Located off site. Provides screening to site. Crowns overhang roof of structure and site by around 2m.</td>
<td>Reduce from structure creating 1m clearance. Reduce back to boundary if required.</td>
<td>No tree protection required.</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Lockhart Garratt Ltd**  
Trees, Woodland, Forestry
Dear Robert

Castle Primary School Noise Survey
Northampton Primary Schools

1.0 Summary

SRL was commissioned by Galliford Try Construction Ltd to do an environmental noise survey at the existing Castle Primary School site. This survey was to help us establish the dominant noise sources present on the site and to assess the feasibility of various ventilation strategies for the proposed new build area of the site.

We measured ambient noise levels at the Castle Primary School site on 1 July 2011. As the noise levels at this site are relatively high we have produced an acoustic model of the site using the survey results to predict façade noise levels, see figure 1 overleaf.

The majority of teaching rooms in the proposed building require attenuated openings to achieve the BB93 criteria for indoor ambient noise levels. The ground and first floor classrooms furthest away from Barrack Road on the western end of the building can be naturally ventilated using open windows. The ground and first floor classrooms on the eastern end of the building must not have any openings in the façade facing directly onto Barrack Road. If these two classrooms are ventilated through the façade running perpendicular to Barrack Road, attenuated openings can be used instead of a full mechanical ventilation system. The classrooms in between will need attenuated openings.

2.0 Survey Data

Our measurement locations are shown in Appendix C. The survey positions were selected to represent the main noise sources around the school site. This excludes noise from pupils as BB93 states that this should not be included in noise break-in assessments. The tabulated results of the survey are shown in Appendix B.

The dominant noise source around the school site is road traffic on Barrack Road (A508). There are also contributions from light aircraft and pedestrians.
3.0 Acoustic Model

A 3D model of the area surrounding the school was constructed using Bruel & Kjaer Predictor v6.2 from Architect’s plans and our survey observations. The noise sources from the survey were used in the model to calculate the ambient noise levels around the school site. The results of the modelling are shown in Figure 1 below. The noise levels range from 44dB (L_{Aeq}) at the western façade of the proposed building to 63dB (L_{Aeq}) at the eastern façade closest to Barrack Road. The noise contours have been coloured into bands to show what ventilation strategies can be used in different areas of the site. Table 1 below gives ventilation strategies for the different zones.

Figure 1 – Noise Model

Table 1 - Ventilation strategies for different zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>L_{Aeq} range, dB</th>
<th>General teaching</th>
<th>Group Areas/ Breakout Spaces</th>
<th>Circulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>&lt;52</td>
<td>Natural ventilation, 5% of floor area</td>
<td>Natural ventilation, &gt;5% of floor area</td>
<td>Natural ventilation, &gt;5% of floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light yellow</td>
<td>52-57</td>
<td>Attenuated natural ventilation with mixed mode fans</td>
<td>Natural ventilation, 5% of floor area</td>
<td>Natural ventilation, &gt;5% of floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark yellow</td>
<td>57-62</td>
<td>Attenuated natural ventilation with mixed mode fans</td>
<td>Attenuated natural ventilation with mixed mode fans</td>
<td>Natural ventilation, 5% of floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>62-67</td>
<td>Mechanical ventilation</td>
<td>Attenuated natural ventilation with mixed mode fans</td>
<td>Attenuated natural ventilation with mixed mode fans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have assumed natural ventilation needs 5% of the floor area as façade openings for the 8l/s/pupil ventilation rate, we have included the 5dB relaxation allowed by BB101 for natural ventilation. For 3l/s/pupil ventilation rate the openings must be limited to 1.6% of the floor area.

Where spaces cannot be fully naturally ventilated due to the ambient noise levels, attenuated openings can be used. Unfortunately this tends to make it difficult to draw the air through the opening due to the increased resistance and therefore a mixed mode system may be required. In this case we will apply the 5dB relaxation allowed by BB101 to the natural ventilation inlets, however the mixed mode fans must be attenuated to meet the BB93 indoor ambient noise levels.

There are no mandatory requirements for ‘ancillary spaces’; kitchens, offices, staff rooms, corridors, stairwells and toilets.

Any noise created by services (other than that from teaching equipment such as computers and projectors) is required to meet BB93 ambient noise levels at a duty of 3l/s/person. This includes break-in from external plant to teaching spaces. Mechanical services ducts must not penetrate partitions between classrooms. The ducts must run in the circulation space, with individual branches off into teaching spaces. The indoor ambient noise level requirements for standard rooms are given in Appendix E. BB101 allows a 5dB relaxation for the 8l/s/pupil ventilation rate where natural ventilation is used.

The noise levels from all plant must be attenuated to 45dB(A) at openable windows and rooflights.

Once a ventilation strategy has been agreed we will propose suitable glazing systems and façade constructions that are capable of achieving the required internal noise levels.

Please call me if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely

Chris Wright
For and on behalf of
SRL Technical Services Limited
Tel: 01787 247595
Email: cwright@srltsl.com
Appendix A – Survey Details

A1.1 Location of Survey

Castle Primary School, St Georges Street, Northampton. NN1 2TR

A1.2 Date & Time of Survey

1 July 2011 09:30-12:50

A1.3 Personnel Present During Survey

Allen Smalls (SRL Ltd)

A1.4 Instrumentation

Bruel & Kjaer

Type 2260 Sound Level Meter (SRL No. 739)
Type ZC 0032 Microphone Pre-Amp (SRL No. 741)
Type 4189 Microphone (SRL No. 742)
Type 4231 Sound Level Calibrator (SRL No. 819)

A1.5 Calibration Procedure

Before and after the survey the measurement apparatus was check calibrated to an accuracy of +0.1dB using the type 4231 Sound Level Calibrator. The Calibrator produces a sound pressure level of 94 dB re 2x10^{-5} Pa at a frequency of 1 kHz.

A1.6 Survey Procedure

Ambient noise levels were monitored at various positions around the sites as shown in Appendix C. The measurements are tabulated in Appendix B and an explanation of acoustic terms is given in Appendix D.

A1.7 Weather Conditions

Dry, still, little cloud
Appendix B – Survey Manned Measurement Results

Table B1 - Measured Ambient Noise Levels (dB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>End Time</th>
<th>L_{Aeq}</th>
<th>L_{A10}</th>
<th>L_{A90}</th>
<th>L_{Amax}</th>
<th>L_{A1}</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10:02</td>
<td>10:12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>~10m from curb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12:24</td>
<td>12:32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>09:48</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Approx. location of proposed building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12:35</td>
<td>12:46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All measurements in dB re 20 μPa

Table B2 - L_{eq} Octave Band Levels (dB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>63</th>
<th>125</th>
<th>250</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>1k</th>
<th>2k</th>
<th>4k</th>
<th>dB(A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10:02</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12:24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>09:48</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12:35</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All measurements in dB re 20 μPa
Appendix C – Survey Positions on existing Site
Appendix D – Noise Measurement Parameter Definitions

$L_{A90}$ - The "A" weighted sound pressure level that is exceeded for 90% of the measurement period. It is commonly used as the "Background Noise Level".

$L_{A10}$ - The "A" weighted sound pressure level that is exceeded for 10% of the measurement period. This is often used for assessing traffic noise.

$L_{A1}$ - The "A" weighted sound pressure level that is exceeded for 1% of the measurement period.

$L_{Aeq}$ - The "A" weighted equivalent continuous sound pressure level. A representation of a continuous sound level containing the same amount of sound energy as the measured varying noise, over the measurement period. It can be considered as the "average" noise level.

$L_{A\max}$ - The maximum "A" weighted sound pressure level during the measurement period.
### Appendix E – BB93 Criteria for Indoor Ambient Noise Levels in Teaching Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Room</th>
<th>Upper limit for internal ambient noise level (dB L_Aeq (30 minutes))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Classroom</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Area/ Breakout Space</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Drainage

It is proposed to connect the new foul water drainage from the extension to the existing foul water drainage system serving the school.

The existing foul water drainage system serving the school will be checked for available capacity as part of the detailed design.

The existing foul water drainage system serving the school eventually discharges to the public sewerage system. A Section 106 (Water Industry Act) Agreement will be entered into, to agree the increase in flows to the public sewerage system.

Surface Water drainage from impermeable areas created by the development will be treated in line with current regulations in relation to flood risk. In this instance, surface water will discharge to a new soakaway located on the site. This is in light of favourable soil infiltration rates being indicated in ground investigation reports from previous projects.

External Works

Hard standing areas accessible to pedestrians only are proposed. In this instance CBR testing is not considered necessary.

DSA Drawing 11/13261/SK50 indicates a preliminary drainage strategy for the proposed development. This is based on limited archive information supplied to DSA.

The extent of new topographical survey required to complete the detailed design is indicated on the above drawing.

The extent of existing drainage recommended to be CCTV surveyed to verify its condition is indicated on the above drawing.

The location of soil infiltration rate testing to BRE Digest 365 is indicated on the above drawing. This is required to design surface water infiltration devices.
Evora

No longer compromise performance for style. Evora is a contemporary, low-profile luminaire engineered to incorporate the very latest technologies including integral electronic gear and remote monitoring systems.

Now available for mounting heights of up to 10m and with an extensive range of lamps, from 45W CosmoPolis to 210W Philips MASTERcolour CDM Elite MW, Evora offers specifiers an extremely stylish, highly efficient lighting solution, providing low energy consumption, reduced CO₂ emissions and ultimately low cost of ownership through reduced maintenance and replacement costs.

Meeting the most stringent of performance criteria, Evora’s clean, unobtrusive design, with no visible fastenings is ideally suited to a wide range of applications including road, residential, amenity and car park lighting.

Evora LED available soon
Bracket options

For projects where stylish design is a prerequisite, Evora’s distinctive bracket options complement a wide range of urban environments.

This dedicated range of brackets are manufactured in our UK facility (ensuring a lower carbon footprint) to provide a solution for every need. For further details on all available bracket options please visit www.dwindsor.com (bespoke brackets can be made to special order).
Introducing: MASTERColour® CDM Elite

Combining the lifetime efficiency and reliability of CosmoPolis with an unrivalled colour quality, Evora featuring Philips MASTERColour® CDM Elite MW offers distinct advantages over alternative light sources/competitor products.

High efficiency: excellent colour rendering (CRI 90+) and up to 120 lm/w gives superior, long-lasting white light, which combined with our patented Diamond Optic® reflector, could result in increased column spacings/fewer products needed to meet your lighting requirements – maximising any investment

Miniaturisation: Extremely compact the CDM Elite MW is 50% smaller than conventional HPI and HPL lamps yet offers improved efficiency and light distribution

Environmentally friendly: featuring low mercury and no lead, the high efficiency of the lamp and electronic driver means lower energy consumption and reduced CO² emissions. The long lamp life translates to reduced maintenance and replacement costs

Thermal Management

Evora has been designed from its very conception to provide exceptional performance.

With intelligent thermal management, Evora’s electronic components are housed within an active ‘Cool-Zone’. Separated from the heat source (lamp), the components operate at considerably lower temperatures, typically 20°C below the maximum allowable operating temperatures; consequently service life can be considerably extended.

Typically a 10°C reduction in the temperature of the electronic ballast can increase life by circa 50,000 hours. Evora’s innovative Cool-Zone, which can incorporate integral control gear, photocell and remote monitoring units, is expected to provide an increased service life in excess of 100,000 hours (when standard electronic control gear is specified)*.

Evora’s superior thermal capabilities ensure that it is suitable for the NEW Philips 210W MASTERColour® CDM Elite MW (flat glass version only). Despite the high temperature generated by the 210W lamp, Evora’s unique Cool-Zone guarantee’s that the temperature of the electronic ballast remains within limits, safeguarding the service life of the gear and luminaire.

Electronic Ballasts

Evora will accept all of the most widely used market-available electronic ballasts for high pressure sodium, metal halide and CosmoPolis lamps.

Owing to Evora’s exceptional thermal management, ballasts will operate at much lower temperatures than the manufacturers recommended limits, extending life and reducing the lifetime carbon footprint of the product.

The benefits of electronic ballasts include:

Energy Savings: With greater efficiency compared to magnetic ballasts, electronic ballasts offer the same light output whilst consuming less power, reducing running costs and carbon footprint.

Lamp Life: Electronic ballasts with “soft” ignition all but eliminate wear on the lamp’s electrodes which is a major cause of light output depreciation and lamp failure. Lamps operate for much longer (reportedly up to twice as long), increasing service intervals and reducing maintenance costs and carbon footprint.

Light Output: Lamps run on electronic gear operate at a constant light output across their life irrespective of supply voltage variation.

Dimming: Certain electronic ballasts are able to dim discharge light sources, providing lower light levels during off-peak periods, lower energy use and carbon savings.

Remote Monitoring

The Evora is designed to accommodate the most popular remote monitoring systems on the market in a low ambient temperature environment, thus enhancing service life.

What is Remote Monitoring?

Using a remote monitoring system allows the control and monitoring of a luminaire from a PC/laptop or even mobile phone through mains-borne signalling or wireless technologies.

Using compatible software, the range of operations include:

- Ability to change programming depending on site specific requirements
- Pre-programmed dimming and switching of individual luminaires or groups of luminaires
- Dimming can be configured in timed stages for different groups of fittings, with the ability to ramp up light levels during peak periods or in the event of an emergency
- Lamp-life prediction and energy consumption monitoring
- Remote fault recognition and diagnosis, and the ability to send automated messages to your contractor when site attendance is required

Lamps can now be monitored prior to failure therefore lamp changes and cleaning programmes can be efficiently planned and intervals extended. With scouting for lamps now completely avoidable, the carbon footprint of luminaire maintenance is reduced.

* Hanard Engineering Plc
1. High pressure die-cast aluminium construction
2. Single push button, for tool-less access
3. Cool-Zone housing control gear, photocell and remote monitoring units
4. Silicone gaskets
5. Plug/socket lamp connection and removable gear tray, retained by spring clips for lifetime tool-less maintenance
6. Built-in mechanical stop prevents over-opening
7. Quick release latch giving tool-less access to lamp
8. Optic contained within own chamber to contain heat, facilitating natural convection through canopy membrane
9. Secondary safety latch to ensure safe opening
Evora

Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Dimensions (mm)</th>
<th>Weight (kg)</th>
<th>Windage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evora</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evora*</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* with flat glass

Features:

- Intelligent thermal management with active Cool-Zone - reduces operating temperature and extends service life of the electronic gear, providing lower life-time maintenance costs
- 8 year DW Windsor guarantee on standard electronic ballasts
- Product design life circa 40 years
- Available with high-transmission flat glass for zero upward light pollution, or vandal-resistant polycarbonate bowl (IK10)
- Wide range of light sources, including Philips MASTERColour® CDM Elite MW for superior colour quality over life
- The sustainable choice - WEEE compliant, Evora is 98% recyclable
- Evora offers tool-free access and maintenance via single push-button latch
- Extremely low profile gives windage of just 0.05m² with flat glass and 0.07m² with dished glazing
- Range of distinctive bracket options available

Options

Evora:
For mounting at 6 – 10 metres

Evora LED:
For mounting at 6 – 8 metres

Glazing:
Polycarbonate bowl (IK10)
Flat Toughened Glass

Optical Control:
Diamond Optic®
LED Array (individually lensed)
Road Optic

Light Source:
45 – 140W CosmoWhite
*210W CDM Elite MW
70 – 150W CDO-TT
70, 150, *250W SON-T+/HQI-E
70, 100, 150W CMH Streetwise
70, 150W CDM-T
42, 57W PL-T

* flat glass only

Mounting:
Side entry (42mm Ø)
Direct entry (76mm Ø)

Recyclable: 98%

Other:
Will incorporate a wide range of electronic gear types, including CosmoPolis
Will incorporate a wide range of remote monitoring systems
Miniature photocell available
Wire wound gear available, with timed ignitor as standard
Obtrusive light shield (except for flat glass)

Evora LED available April 2011,
for further details visit www.dwwindsor.com

Road optic available September 2011

Materials

Body: Pressure die-cast aluminium
Seals: Silicone rubber
Finish: Polyester powder coated, any standard RAL
Site Wall-mounted luminaire
for compact fluorescent lamps

44570.000 Graphit m
TC-TEL 42W GX24q-4 3200lm
ECG

Product description
Reflector: metal, white (RAL9010) powder-coated.
Cover: impact-resistant plastic, clear, half painted silver light-proof.
Screw-mounted cover ring with protective grid: corrosion-resistant cast aluminium, double powder-coated.
Protection mode IP65: dust-proof and water jet-proof.
Weight: 3.50 kg