



Leicester  
City Council

## FORWARD TIMETABLE OF CONSULTATION AND MEETINGS:

Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee  
Cabinet  
Council

15 March 2011  
21 March 2011  
24 March 2011

---

### Investing in Our Children's Capital Programme 2011/12

---

#### 1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the Investing in Our Children's Capital Programme for 2010/11 and to set out an approach to capital spend for 2011/12.

#### 2. Summary

- 2.1 This report is an update on the Children's Capital Programme 2010/11 and sets out previously approved projects which are continuing into 2011/12.
- 2.2 In addition, this report sets out the capital funding allocations for Children and Young People for 2011/12, proposes how these should be spent and requests approval for these proposals. Unusually, the Government has issued funding only for one year, pending the outcomes of the national James Review.
- 2.3 An approach for the annual commissioning of the Children's Capital Programme in future years is in development and will be part of the annual commissioning programme for Investing in our Children Priority Board. Details of this approach and process will be presented to Cabinet in due course.

#### 3. Recommendations

- 3.1 **The Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee** is recommended to note the report and to make any observations to the Cabinet.
- 3.2 **Cabinet** is asked to recommend to Council:
- (i) That the brought forward and new funding at Appendix A1 be noted as the resources available for Children's Services capital investment in 2011/12;
  - (ii) That the schemes identified at Appendix A2 be approved as the planned spending against the new funding for Basic Need,

Capital Maintenance, Devolved Formula Capital and Building Schools for the Future; and

- (ii) The split at Appendix A2 between schemes in Block A which can proceed without further approval and schemes in Block B which require a report to the Executive Function.

3.3 **Council** is recommended to accept the recommendations of Cabinet.

## 4. Report

### 4.1 Context

4.1.1 Over the last 10 years the Council has seen a significant increase in capital investment in schools, reflecting the increase across England during this period. This increase in investment can be attributed in part to securing targeted funding such as Building Schools for the Future (BSF) and Primary Capital Programme (PCP) funding in 2004 and 2008 respectively. Leicester City Council has been able to make significant investment into schools, to the amount of £64.7m secondary and £26.7m primary.

4.1.2 As part of BSF we have rebuilt 3 secondary schools and remodelled/refurbished a fourth. At the point that the PCP funding draws to a close in August 2011, the Council will have rebuilt and expanded 2 primary schools and remodelled/refurbished 16 primary schools (including the kitchen programme). This means that based on current numbers on roll a total of 6,038 children will have directly benefitted from the capital investment over the last 6 years.

4.1.3 The recent changes to Government funding for capital schemes has led to a reassessment of the programme and this report is a culmination of that work providing an update on the 2010/11 programme, presenting the key challenges that the Council and schools face and setting out our proposals for capital investment over the next 12 months. In previous years there has been a 3-year forecast for capital investment however, as the Council is working to a 1-year Government funding allocation it is unclear what funding beyond 2011/12 will be available (with the exception of BSF).

4.1.4 In previous years the capital programme report was structured as 0-11 and 11-19 programmes. These age categories have now been removed given the move towards a single Children's Capital team, as part of the Strategic Asset Management and Transforming the Learning Environment structural reviews. Building Schools for the Future (BSF) is now treated as a programme within the overall 0-19 Children's Capital programme.

### 4.2 The Challenges

4.2.1 Over the coming years there are some key challenges facing the Council which have influenced the proposals presented in this report. The challenges are summarised below and then discussed in more detail.

- (a) Reduction in funding (e.g. Basic Need, Devolved Formula Capital (DfC) allocated directly to schools) and uncertainty regarding future targeted capital for primary schools;
  - (b) Projected increase in pupil numbers over the next 10 years; by 2018 an additional 3,000 – 3,500 primary places are likely to be required;
  - (c) The pressure on the Council to reduce carbon emissions, with schools being responsible for 30% of the Council's carbon production;
  - (d) Consortium of Local Authority Special Programme (CLASP) buildings built in the 1960s and 1970s and their short/long term viability as building structures;
  - (e) The general deterioration of school building stock with less capital for maintenance.
- 4.2.2 Other than the on-going BSF programme, the Council will receive two key Children's Services capital grants in 2011/2012 - Basic Need and Capital Maintenance. Basic Need is to help the Council provide sufficient accommodation to meet increases in pupil numbers. The Capital Maintenance Grant is to cover a range of needs previously covered by separate targeted funding (e.g. Individual Access Needs and the Kitchens Programme) in schools and Surestart Children's Centres. A breakdown of how it is proposed to make best use of these funding sources is shown at 4.3.2. Both grants are expected to be non-ringfenced; however, the Council will clearly wish to have regard to their intended purpose. An allocation is also expected for Disabled Children's Short Breaks, but the Government has not yet announced the details.
- 4.2.3 Pupil projections over the next 10 years estimate an increase in required pupil places of between 3,000 and 3,500. A detailed assessment of this challenge and proposed approach to provision in the future is to be presented to Cabinet later in the year.
- 4.2.4 At current levels of energy use and based on the Department of Energy & Climate Change (DECC) predictions of future energy prices, by 2035 Leicester schools could be spending £7.25 million per year on energy, up from the current £2.9 million. Between 2010 and 2035 this amounts to an extra £56.5 million on schools' fuel expenditure. There will also be an additional cost under the Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC). If the cost of one tonne of carbon dioxide under the Commitment were to reach £40 (from the current £12) then the Council would expect to pay approximately £8.5 million between 2010 and 2035. This would take the total cost up to £65 million. Failing to reduce energy use in schools over the next 25 years could expose schools to these types of operational cost increases. Therefore, there is a challenge to, wherever possible, build, extend and remodel school buildings with a view to carbon reduction with reduced capital funding.
- 4.2.5 CLASP buildings are pre-fabricated, modular buildings. Leicester has 13 primary schools with CLASP buildings that are now reaching the end of their lifespan and due to the difference in materials used at the time of their construction require significant maintenance and ultimately replacement. The replacement of secondary school CLASP buildings is already accounted for in the BSF programme.

4.2.6 Whilst there has been significant capital investment over the last few years to primary schools, as part of the early stages of the previous Government's Primary Capital Programme, this has only reached approximately 5% of primary schools. For primary schools the reduction in maintenance and capital funding will present a real challenge where the condition of their building is in deterioration and for some schools this may be exacerbated where they are coping with increased pupil numbers.

For secondary schools, there is a more positive outlook, in that Leicester City is one of the few councils nationally to have retained its BSF programme, albeit with some capital and revenue cost efficiencies, and these schools will be supported by a facilities managed service as part of the BSF contract.

4.2.7 Despite these challenges, the Council is still firmly committed to the One Leicester Priority of Investing in our Children and maximising positive outcomes for children and young people remains at the heart of the children's capital programme.

### 4.3 Funding

4.3.1 Pending the national James Review into schools' capital funding, delayed from December 2010 to March/April 2011, it is unclear what targeted capital funding will be available beyond 2011/12 and the related funding regulations. This review was expected to report in November 2010 and was delayed with two further publication dates missed. All targeted funding received in 2010/11 and earlier (such as PCP, Kitchens Fund and Co-location) has been allocated for previously approved projects and will be spent by August 2011. Therefore, this report sets out proposals assuming there will be no further targeted funding for 2011/12, other than Basic Need, Capital Maintenance, Disabled Children's Short Breaks and the on-going BSF Programme.

4.3.2 Summarised in the Table 1 below are the known funding allocations for 2011/12, excluding BSF and funding paid direct to Voluntary Aided Schools (or the Diocese, as appropriate).

**Table 1 – Funding for 2011/12 (excluding BSF and VA School Funding)**

Funding Source	Total	Purpose
Basic Need	£6.94m	To ensure sufficient number of pupil places across schools in the City. The DfE headline narrative is <i>to provide school places where needed....in all categories of taxpayer-funded schools.</i>
Capital Maintenance	£4.26m	To be used for schools and SureStart Children's Centres. The DfE headline narrative is <i>to enable local authorities to support the needs of the schools that they maintain and for the Sure Start children's centres in their area.</i>

Aiming Higher for Disabled Children	Not yet known	The Government has announced that there will be funding for short breaks but as yet the allocation is not known.
Children's Homes	£0.10m	Planned capital works to the Council's children's residential homes.

4.3.3 There is no further capital funding for new Sure Start initiatives, which included early years, children's centres and extended services. However, by August 2011, the Council will have successfully completed its capital build of Children's Centres and Integrated Service Centres across the City. The sector has benefitted from a three year investment programme in minor works, improvements and resources for childcare quality and access. Provision for capital maintenance is proposed to be set aside from the Capital Maintenance Grant for 2011/12 to support these facilities, although significant maintenance is not anticipated due to the relatively new nature of these buildings.

4.3.4 Other areas of children's provision for which no specific funding is available are set out below:

- Adventure Playgrounds
- Community playing fields
- ICT (schools will need to finance ICT from DfC or delegated revenue budgets)
- Outdoor play

4.3.5 In view of the reduced revenue settlement including the significant reduction in funds due to loss of government grant, it is no longer possible to progress My Place as a capital scheme.

#### Schools' Devolved Formula Capital

4.3.6 Devolved Formula Capital (DfC) is allocated to schools on a national formula basis and schools may spend it for capital purposes within three years.

4.3.7 Schools have previously been asked to commit a percentage of their DfC when entering the PCP; 50% over 3 years for remodelled/refurbished schools and 75% over 3 years for a rebuild. The notional financial commitments from these schools were based on previous years' DfC allocations. There was an agreement from the Council to support schools should there be any future difficulties in meeting these payments. Schools will see a reduction in DfC averaging some 80%, so there could be an immediate shortfall in schools' financial commitments to the programme. At present we have an 'in principle' total of approximately £0.9m committed, with £0.7m outstanding and £0.3m from 2011 onwards.

4.3.8 The average 80% reduction in DfC will result in allocations for a typical primary school (with 400 pupils) of £8,500, and a typical secondary (with 1,000 pupils) of £20,875. Therefore, a commitment of 50% or 75% of even this reduced amount could present schools with very little capital for any other planned or reactive maintenance, investment in the building, ICT or equipment. For schools with a substantial carry forward of DfC these commitments may be less of a challenge, certainly for this financial year, although the reduced funding is likely to remain and therefore may become a challenge in later years.

4.3.9 The funding shortfall due to reductions in DfC for 2011/12 is approximately £0.2m and this paper proposes that for 2011/12 Basic Need funds are used to cover the likely shortfall from schools' commitments for existing and completed projects for this financial year. For future years, schools will be consulted on the approach once the Government's plans for funding capital are clearer.

#### Building Schools for the Future

4.3.10 Members have received a number of reports about the plans for, and progress of, the BSF programme, and each Final Business Case / Financial Close will require the specific approval of the Executive. A key programme-wide report was considered by Cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2009.

4.3.11 At the end of 2010, the Council was asked to conduct a cost efficiencies exercise on the BSF schemes. In February 2011, Partnerships for Schools (PfS) confirmed that all design and build schools and both PFI schools were approved to proceed on the basis of the percentage cost efficiencies proposed.

4.3.12 The BSF scheme at Rushey Mead School is expected to reach financial close around the end of March 2011, with works starting on site shortly thereafter. The next scheme, covering Crown Hills and City of Leicester schools under PFI arrangements, has recently progressed to Stage 2 and the Leicester Miller Education Company (LMEC – the Local Education Partnership) has been instructed to progress the scheme to completion of stage 2. There will also be some ICT only works to Student Learning Centres and Pupil Referral Units. The Council and LMEC are working with schools to deliver an ambitious programme that will see all the remaining secondary schools redeveloped under BSF (other than Madani High and the Samworth Academy which are in recently constructed buildings).

4.3.13 The BSF programme for 2011/12 will comprise the works to Rushey Mead school, the on-going development of the PFI scheme for Crown Hills and City of Leicester to completion of Stage 2 and onwards to Financial Close, the small ICT only schemes and the design and development work for the subsequent schools in the programme. It should be noted that design and development work by LMEC ahead of Financial Close for each project is at the Council's risk; once Financial Close is reached, the at-risk costs incurred by the Council are offset against the BSF capital funding for that school.

4.3.14 The Council has made plans to arrange for contingencies which may be applied to these BSF schemes, if and as required. A contingency of up to £2m is considered prudent for the schemes to be progressed in 2011/12, and forms part of the wider contingency of up to £12m to be applied across the whole BSF programme as reported to Cabinet on the 14 December 2009. Under these arrangements, any contingencies not spent remain available for future schemes within the BSF programme. The Council successfully adopted robust variation controls for its BSF projects previously at Phase 1 and these will again be applied as a control on any additional spending which may arise.

#### Capital Receipts and advances to BSF related schemes

4.3.15 The Children's Capital Programme has for some time noted an expectation of future capital receipts from the sale of former school sites. These have not yet been realised due to the unfavourable economic climate. Advances have also been made to enable the development of facilities that may subsequently be funded by BSF schemes, for example the Gymnastics Centre at New College. The potential additional funds that could become available from these sources total in excess of £5m. However, due to the continued uncertainty, it is not proposed at this stage to commit any capital spending in expectation of their receipt. Should they be received, then additional schemes will be brought forward for consideration.

#### 4.4 Capital Programme 2011/12

4.4.1 Set out in Table 2 below are the details of existing projects which have been approved in previous years' capital programme reports and where work is continuing in 2011/12.

**Table 2-  
Previous Years' Approved Projects continuing into 2011/12 (excluding BSF)**

<b>Project &amp; Description</b>	<b>Revised Budget</b>	<b>11/12 Programme Budget</b>	<b>Reason Budget Increase</b>	<b>Progress Update</b>
<p><b>Barley Croft Primary School</b></p> <p>Major refurbishment of the school to include dedicated circulation space and a shared entrance for the school, Healthy Living Centre and Youth services.</p>	£2.8m	£2.1m	The scope of the works has changed to accommodate the inclusion of the shared entrance. Issues at the beginning of the programme resulted in a requirement for additional mobiles to ensure no impact on school delivery.	<p>Phase 1 of the school works has been completed and the remainder of the school works commenced in February 2011.</p> <p>This project, including the entrance is to complete November 2011</p>
<p><b>Mellor Primary School</b></p> <p>Complete school rebuild with scope to increase to a 3 form entry school.</p>	£8.6m	£5.6m	n/a	This project is progressing to programme and the build (without external work) is set to complete August 2011.
<p><b>St Barnabas</b></p> <p>Purchase of the adjacent vicarage</p>	£2.5m	£2.3m	The original budget figure was based on a cost per sqm estimate,	Providing that the newt migration is successful this

<p>and remodel into class bases. Internal remodelling including extension of the hall. Due to the constrained nature of the site the inclusion of a roof garden to allow increased outdoor learning and play opportunities.</p>			<p>this has been re-evaluated for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the need to focus on providing outdoor play and learning;</li> <li>- security issues in terms of access and safeguarding</li> <li>- a clearer understanding of building condition and related requirements.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, cost has increased due to the discovery of great crested newts and the resultant delay and mitigation measures.</p>	<p>project will commence summer 2011.</p>
<p><b>Alderman Richard Hallam (Kitchen)</b></p> <p>This project is part of the kitchen and dining programme. This will see a major refurbishment, to the current kitchen and dining block.</p>	£0.9m	£0.9m	n/a	<p>This project will commence on site April 2011</p>
<p><b>Northfield House (Kitchen)</b></p> <p>This project is part of the kitchen and dining programme. Building new kitchen and dining room and demolition of old horsa hut.</p>	£1.2m	£0.8m	n/a	<p>This project is progressing to programme and budget and is scheduled to complete in 2011.</p>
<p><b>Integrated Service Centres</b></p> <p>Dedicated spaces</p>	£3.5m	£2.8m	n/a	<p>These projects are scheduled to complete by August 2011</p>



to promote integrated multidisciplinary support services to communities.				
<b>YMCA</b> Remodelling of the YMCA premises at East Street. (Project managed by the YMCA)	£2.6m	£0.6m	n/a	This project is scheduled to complete later this year.
<b>Beaumont Leys and Crown Hills (CLCs)</b> ICT and planned maintenance works.	£0.3m	£0.1m		This project will be completed August 2011 (subject to the review of CLCs given the changes to revenue funding).
<b>Outstanding Expenditure on other completed and continuing projects</b>		£3.0m		Including final payments of fee's & retentions at Children's Services projects.
<b>Schools' Managed Funding</b>	£8.3m	£4.5m	Schools have 3 years to spend their DFC allocation, hence the balance rolled forward.	Given DFC reductions from 11/12 it is anticipated that schools will draw down their DFC reserves.

4.4.2 This report proposes to increase the budgets for the schemes at Barleycroft and St Barnabas Primary Schools by a total of £1m as detailed in the table above, as part of the approved 2011/12 programme.

4.4.3 As part of the 2010/11 programme, a series of feasibility studies were undertaken in preparation for setting up the 2011/12 programme. Set out in Table 3 below are the details regarding the selection and estimated project budgets at the end of the feasibility studies:

**Table 3 – Feasibility Studies undertaken in 2010/11**

School	Scope of works	Reason for prioritisation	Project budget
Forest Lodge Primary	The proposal is for a rebuild, 2 form entry with a 3 form entry	This project remains a priority. It did not proceed	£8.6m (this is still a high level)

	infrastructure to allow expansion to cope with projected pupil increases across the city.	in 2010/11 due to the need to address immediate structural issues elsewhere.	estimate)
Montrose Primary	Option One:  2 additional class bases - Mobile replacement.	This school was ranked highly on the original Primary Strategy for Change prioritisation list and was also considered as part of the Council's mobile replacement programme.	£2.7m
	Option Two; 2 additional class bases - mobile replacement and additional internal remodel/refurbishment to hall.		£4.3m
Willowbrook Primary	Single class base extension – mobile replacement	This was identified as a priority as part of the Council's classroom replacement programme.	£1.2m
Scraptoft Valley Primary	Additional class base (mobile replacement) and additional internal remodel/refurbishment	This is an area where there are significant challenges around pupil numbers. This feasibility was undertaken to provide options to achieve an early increase in pupil places.	£1.8m

4.4.4 All of the above projects fall within identified 'hotspots' (areas of high demand for school places compared to supply) within the city and will help to alleviate the medium term needs to accommodate increasing pupil numbers. Therefore, approval is requested to proceed with Willowbrook, Scraptoft Valley, and Montrose (Option 1) funded by the 2011/12 Basic Need allocation as set out below:

**Table 4: Breakdown of proposed allocation of Basic Need funding**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Budget</b>
Montrose (Option 1)	£2.7m
Willowbrook	£1.2m
Scraptoft Valley	£1.8m
School Contribution Shortfall 2011/12	£0.2m
Feasibilities*	£0.4m
Cost increases on previous years' schemes	£0.25m
Contingency	£0.35m
<b>Total</b>	<b>£6.9m</b>

\*A paper will follow in 2011 outlining proposals for further feasibility studies.

- 4.4.5 It is considered that progressing Forest Lodge as a complete rebuild remains a priority, however sufficient funds are not currently available in the absence of a medium term / three year funding settlement from the Government. It is proposed that this project is reviewed after the outcomes of the James Review, when the longer term capital planning framework is clearer, and that a paper be scheduled for later in 2011 to explore options for progression.
- 4.4.6 Given the introduction of the Capital Maintenance grant for 2011/12, there is a need to consider how this funding will be allocated. Set out in Table 5 below are the proposed budgets to be set aside for each category of activity/work.

**Table 5 – Proposed Allocation of the Capital Maintenance Grant**

<b>Area</b>	<b>Budget</b>
Individual Access Needs in schools	£0.2m
Children's Centre Maintenance	£0.1m
Other Children's assets maintenance e.g. Adventure playgrounds, community playgrounds	£0.2m
Minor Works in schools: To cover reactive works such as Ofsted reports, emergency mobiles etc.	£1.5m
Completion of current schemes	£1.0m
CLASP schools: to assess and undertake the immediate maintenance requirements and look to a replacement programme *	£1.05m
Contingency	£0.25m
<b>Total</b>	<b>£4.3m</b>

\* A paper will be scheduled later to update on the allocation of this funding.

- 4.4.7 It should be noted that the spending is not fully profiled across 2011/12 and future years in this report, and this profiling will be undertaken at a later date.

## **BSF**

- 4.4.8 Projected expenditure on BSF projects to be included in the 2011/12 approved programme comprises:
- 4.4.9 **Rushey Mead School** - Works to Rushey Mead School under a Design and Build Scheme, for which Council has previously approved provision of £19.607m. This is funded by Government Grants together with contributions from the Council (from land sales across the school estate or Prudential Borrowing and s106 developer contributions) and the school. Cabinet approved this project on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2011 and authorised the Strategic Director Children, in consultation with the Cabinet Lead, to take such decisions as she thinks fit to implement the scheme within the scope of the Final Business Case.
- 4.4.10 **Crown Hills and City of Leicester** – These are to be developed as a joint Private Finance Initiative (PFI) scheme at an expected total estimated capital cost of £50.5m (subject to any further efficiencies and confirmation of the total scheme value to be agreed with Partnerships for Schools). The Council would not normally expect to make capital payments for such schemes, except for

agreed supplementary funding contributions; other than such contributions, the costs will be met over 25 years from Government PFI grant. These are expected to include Council contributions as with Rushey Mead, a contribution from the school and a grant from the English Cricket Board. Expenditure of £949k to develop the scheme to BSF Stage 1 has already been incurred and Cabinet on 7<sup>th</sup> March 2011 authorised the scheme to progress to Stage 2 and for the Leicester Miller Education Partnership (LMEC) to be authorised to commence progressing the scheme to Stage 2 completion, at the Council's risk.

4.4.11 **Small ICT-only schemes:** These are expected to include Carisbrooke SLC, The Newry, Millgate Lodge SLC and will cost £0.2m. The precise allocations for each scheme may be revised, following reallocation of places previously identified at the Coleman Centre SLC (now closed).

4.4.12 **Future Project Development** – As noted above (para. 4.3.13), design and development work will be required for the subsequent schools in the programme. In the immediate future, these are expected to include the Children's Hospital School, St Pauls Secondary School, Hamilton Community College and Netherhall Special School. Such work by LMEC ahead of Financial Close for each project is at the Council's risk; once Financial Close is reached, the at-risk costs incurred by the Council are offset against the BSF capital funding for that school. Significant resources will need to be committed at risk to deliver this ambitious programme. It is proposed that the amount committed at risk and any changes to the level of that risk will be kept under monthly review and changes made to the work programme of LMEC and the Council as required. There is no specifically identified funding against which the "at risk" sums can be underwritten. It is proposed that £12.5m be included in the 2011/12 programme and that this be kept under on-going review.

4.4.13 **Contingency** – As noted above (para. 4.3.14), it is considered prudent to include within the programme a contingency of £2m for the schemes to be progressed in 2011/12.

4.4.14 The total proposed provision for BSF schemes is therefore £84.8m. This is not profiled across 2011/12 future years in this report and the profiling will be updated on an on-going basis as the BSF programme develops.

## **5. Financial, Legal, Environmental and Other Implications**

### **5.1 Financial Implications**

This report is concerned with financial implications throughout.

Colin Sharpe, Head of Finance, Investing in Our Children, ext 297750

### **5.2 Legal Implications**

This report was submitted to Legal Services too late for detailed consideration. However, the report concerns capital spend. All contracts should be procured in accordance with the Council's contract procedure rules and sufficient programme capacity should be allowed for this. It is also

recommended that arrangements with schools are agreed before contracts are committed. External funding may be subject to conditions which will need to be satisfied.

Joanna Bunting, Head of Commercial & Property Law

### 5.3 Environmental Implications

As detailed in the report improving the energy efficiency of school buildings is of vital importance if the Council is to meet carbon reduction targets and is also of significant importance from the perspective of the cost of carbon with the projected increased energy costs and the introduction of the CRC (see para. 4.2.4).

Helen Lansdown, Senior Environmental Consultant - Sustainable Procurement

### 5.4 Other Implications

<b>OTHER IMPLICATIONS</b>	<b>YES/ NO</b>	<b>Paragraph/References Within Supporting information</b>
Equal Opportunities	No	
Policy	No	
Sustainable and Environmental	No	
Crime and Disorder	No	
Human Rights Act	No	
Elderly/People on Low Income	No	
Corporate Parenting	No	
Health Inequalities Impact	No	

## 7. Risk Assessment Matrix

No.	Risk	Likelihood (L/M/H)	Severity Impact (L/M/H)	Control Actions (if necessary / or appropriate)
1	The programme is not affordable	L	H	Robust management and monitoring of the funding streams.
2	Overspending on a scheme	M	M	Robust financial management of the outturn of schemes. Review and stop, if possible, any non-essential works on schemes.
3	Slippage	H	L	Robust profiling of expenditure on schemes where possible. Monthly progress meetings and regular reports to Members through the Capital Monitoring reports.
4	Accuracy of Estimates	L	L	Monitoring and review as schemes progress; significance and issues will reflect nature of scheme.

## 8. Background Papers – Local Government Act 1972

- Leicester’s Building Schools for the Future (BSF) Programme – Cabinet, 14<sup>th</sup> December 2009
- CYPS Capital Programme 2010/11: Additional Projects – Cabinet, 7<sup>th</sup> February 2011
- BSF Crown Hills and City of Leicester Joint PFI Scheme: Risks and Issues – Cabinet, 7<sup>th</sup> March 2011

## 9. Report Author

Helen Ryan

Emma Johnstone

Divisional Director Property  
Ext 29 8791

Head of Service 0-11 Programme  
Ext 39 1633

<b>Key Decision</b>	Yes
<b>Reason</b>	Is significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising more than one ward
<b>Appeared in Forward Plan</b>	Yes
<b>Executive or Council Decision</b>	Executive (Cabinet)