

# **Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council Judicial Review Data Collection Analysis**

128

**Date: 22 June 2011**

## **PLEASE NOTE**

**The document in section 1 ‘Basic Need – School Level’ is best viewed in A3 format and has been included as a separate file.**

## Contents

1. Basic Need (Local Authority and school level)
2. ICT
3. Local Issues
4. Costs (Development and Contractual)
5. Prioritisation
6. Condition for schools listed below
7. Suitability for schools listed below
8. Appendix
  - PFS Condition Assessments for schools listed below

### **Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council Schools List**

- a. *Phoenix Collegiate; North, Manor Site*
- b. *Phoenix Collegiate; South, Menzies Site*
- c. *Perryfields High School*
- d. *Oakham Centre, KS3 PRU*
- e. *Brades Lodge*
- f. *The Meadows*
- g. *The Bridge Centre*
- h. *Stuart Bathurst Catholic High School*
- i. *Wood Green High School*
- j. *Heathfield Foundation Technology College*
- k. *Bristnall Hall High School; Existing Site*
- l. *Bristnall Hall High School; Proposed Site at Oldbury College Lower School*

# 1.

## Basic Need

BASIC NEED - SCHOOL LEVEL																
Name of School	Current NOR 11-16 (or total M SEN)	Current NOR 16-18	Proposed NOR 11-16 (or total M SEN)	Proposed NOR 16-18	Type of School	Age Group	Current GFA	Proposed GFA	revised funded GFA for current NOR	difference from current GFA	previous BSF funded GFA for proposed NOR	revised recommended GFA for proposed NOR	comments	Is current GFA sufficient for current NOR?	Is current GFA sufficient for proposed NOR?	Is proposed GFA sufficient for proposed NOR?
Phoenix Collegiate	1648	402	1800	280			8,568									
Phoenix Collegiate - Mareslee Site, Incl Sandwell CLC	1649+402	1649+402	2080				13,537									
Phoenix Collegiate - Combined	1648	402	1800	280	Foundation	11 to 18	22,822		14,803	8,319	18,422	14,580		yes - well in excess	yes - well in excess	proposed GFA not known
Perryfields High School	1025	40	1200	150	Community	11 to 18	8,030		8,138	- 102	11,508	10,010		yes - just	no - insufficient	proposed GFA not known
KB3 PRU	19		20		PRU - 8 day+ exclusions	11 to 18	359		854	- 295	430	1,070		no, but could be acceptable if all places v. temporary	no - insufficient	proposed GFA not known
Grades Lodge (Therapeutic Unit)	15		25		PRU - emotionally disturbed	11 to 18	603		500	13	525	750		yes, just	no, although could be acceptable	proposed GFA not known
The Meadows Sports College	108	80- 11 to 16 48- Post 16	123	75- 11 to 18 50- Post 17	SEN - PMLD, complex w/ all kinds, plus palliative care	11 to 19	4,055		3,210	845	4,325	3,560		yes	yes	proposed GFA not known
KB4 PRU, The Bridge Centre,	52	52	60		PRU - alternative educ. whom rarely return to school	14 to 16	1,500		1,182	318	1,280	1,310		yes - in excess	yes	proposed GFA not known
Stuart Bathurst Catholic High School	705	111	750	124	Voluntary Aided	11 to 18	8,626		8,618	10	8,282	8,983		yes, just	no - insufficient	proposed GFA not known
Wood Green High School	1241	229	1250	240	Academy	11 to 18	18,813		18,814	5,999	12,574	10,955		yes - well in excess	yes - well in excess	proposed GFA not known
Heathfield Foundation Technical College	1378	359	1500	240	Foundation	11 to 18	14,883		12,562	2,311	14,248	12,530		yes - well in excess	yes - well in excess	proposed GFA not known
Bristnall Hall High School (Existing Site)	930	32			Foundation	11 to 18	8,083		7,483	- 1,400				no - seriously deficient	n/a	n/a
Bristnall Hall proposed site			1140	151	Foundation	11 to 18	8,802				11,114	9,839		n/a	no - seriously deficient	proposed GFA not known

Summary of the LA PPP numbers taken from SCAP data

	Capacity	20010 -11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016/17	
		No of pupils	Variance	No of pupils	Variance	No of pupils	Variance	No of pupils	Variance	No of pupils	Variance	No of pupils	Variance	No of pupils	Variance
Sandwell	15,167	14,436	731	14,160	1,007	14,002	1,165	13,881	1,286	13,916	1,251	14,072	1,095	14,306	861

LA	Did the LA's affected BSF proposals plan to provide additional capacity?	Does the LA's revised submission argue for funding for additional capacity?	Is this substantiated by evidence?	Is there a basic need case LA wide that supports the request - analysis of submission against centrally held data?	Is the case based on meeting unmet demand at popular schools, or local BN pressures rather than a LA-wide issue?
Sandwell	BSF plans were to expand Perryfields and Bristnall Hall while reducing capacity at the other stopped schools. Net proposed change for a reduction in capacity.	Expansion of Perryfields and Bristnall Hall schools proposed	Data provided for individual schools based on appropriate methodology	Capacity exists in other secondary schools within the LA so a LA wide case for secondary basic need is not demonstrated	Yes - case of unmet demand - the two schools are over-subscribed. Perryfields 66 pupils over net capacity, Bristnall Hall 103 pupils over net capacity (2010 SCAP data).

## 2. ICT

SANDWELL		
	Issues	Comments
School specific ICT issues	Meadowhall - In order to achieve its vision and expected outcomes, it now needs a new ICT infrastructure	Unable to comment- insufficient evidence.
	Meadowhall - ICT improvements are urgently required to develop student independence e.g. self-opening doors. Wireless is crucial in using the latest technology. New stimulating teaching technologies are required e.g. Avatars, Sensory Floors, Illuminated games markings, animated floors/walls/ceilings, special smells, sensory stimulation and much more. Communication aids including iPads, interactive holograms will do much to improve learning, motivation and independence.	The BSF investment could have met some of these requirements (NB: Reference to the need for Avatars unclear)
	Meadowhall - The provision of specialised learning devices, software and teaching aids	The BSF investment would have provided this
	Phoenix - Manor CLASP building offers "little potential to incorporate a meaningful ICT infrastructure".	Unable to comment- insufficient evidence.
	Bathurst - Ability to make personalised and independent learning a reality for all is gravely compromised by dated ICT infrastructure	Unable to comment- insufficient evidence.
	Wood Green - Insufficient cooling for ICT rooms	The BSF investment would have provided this
	Wood Green - Newton block, impossible to consider installing computers in small classrooms	Unable to comment- insufficient evidence. (no detail provided about the type of solution the school wishes to install and the impact of space limitations.
	Wood Green - Have a key role for ICT in supporting independence, media exchange, data and assessment. It will provide ICT access for all learners when needed. The relatively new controlled conditions examinations are proving difficult to administer as we simply do not have all the available ICT resources that are required.	Unable to comment- insufficient evidence, no data provided to indicate the extent of the issue.
	The Bridge - The unit takes students from all BSF waves so integrated systems and technologies are needed	The BSF investment to both waves would have provided this
	The Meadows - Requires upgrading of ICT Infrastructure	Unable to comment- insufficient evidence.
	Oakham PRU - The Centre will take students from all schools and from academies, so integrated systems and technologies are necessary	The BSF investment to both waves would have provided this
	Oakham PRU - New technologies are essential if the curriculum and its delivery are to be brought into the 21st century: the learning platform, portable display technology, wireless networking and video conferencing in support of off-site learning	The BSF investment would have provided this



<b>Area-wide ICT issues</b>	Wave 5 ICT funding would have supported "developing further business intelligence functions linked to management information systems within the Learning Platform.....Any reductions to the funding levels would mean that such developments are no longer possible "	Unable to comment- insufficient evidence.
	"However, because of the investment already being made in capacity through the Wave 3 projects, it will be possible to deliver a significant proportion of the Sandwell Vision, providing there is investment in ICT infrastructure and services in Wave 5 schools."	Unable to comment - Insufficient detail provided as to the elements of the vision that could be met and the associated costs
	The LA has indicated that wave 3 schools will not be able to utilise new services and infrastructure and this will result in a two tier estate	Insufficient detail has been provided to support a comparison between the wave 3 and 5 ICT provision.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	It is therefore imperative that ICT infrastructure be provided for Wave 5 schools if the investment in Wave 3 ICT infrastructure capacities is to be efficient, effective and not wasted.	Insufficient detail provided to quantify the impact on wave 3 investment and solution utilisation
<b>Educational Implications</b>		
<b>Other</b>		

### **3.**

## **Local Issues**

**SANDWELL**

Headline description	Brief description of issue	Comments
Continual Investment across waves 3 and 5	LA claims that a particular characteristic of Sandwell's BSF programme, as set out to the court during the judicial review, is the fact that the Council was permitted by Partnerships for Schools to treat its programme as one continual stream of investment, despite the arbitrary division of the scheme into two separate waves. In the Local Authority's view, this meant that, unlike some local authorities, Sandwell did not opt to focus on the poor state of some of the school buildings when determining which schools should receive money from the earlier wave of funding, but instead determined priority based on a range of key criteria. This means that some of the Wave 5 schools are in the worst physical condition of any school in Sandwell.	PIS's general policy with regard to allocating funding was not varied. Sandwell did not submit a case for its waves being merged. Where multi-wave authorities progressed in BSF, this did not mean that approval for one wave would automatically lead to approval for the other. The LA was notified on 14/12/06 that the second batch of its projects would be in wave 5; Sandwell's wave 5 did not commence until after a remit meeting on 15/12/09. Sandwell was allowed to vary which schools were in which wave, following discussions with PIS
Prioritisation of Projects	LA submission states that at the point that the original prioritisation exercise was undertaken (SBC development 2006/07) an analysis of existing suitability surveys also revealed that the following Wave 5 projects had "medium to low" suitability: Heathfield, Stuart Bathurst and Wood Green. Again, the LA states that, had Sandwell not been working on the basis of one continuous programme, these projects may well have been prioritised more highly.	We are unable to either substantiate or disagree with this statement.
Community Cohesion (Phoenix Collegiate)	The submission states that "the community of the two schools is a complex mix. The previous Manor population is made up mainly of white, working class families, but with a significant number of Polish children. Menzies is a complete mix, a multi cultural school with around 50% white working class and the other half evenly split between minority groups. There is a significant and growing seed of right wing political extremism in the community that surrounds Manor. They recruit through convincing young people that they do not count in today's society, and that it is the ethnic groups that are responsible for this". The submission states that the school stands "as a beacon against this slow tide of perception and is the singular major positive influence in their lives. By continuing to attend a school in appalling condition and unsuitable for needs the message of hate and prejudice is being significantly fuelled, by investment this would make a lie to the claims that these working class children do not count. Investment to generate first class learning and community facilities in the school would ensure that pupils had a safe area where they could be taught in appropriate facilities and engage in the society view of self improvement through education. In short they would believe it possible when they were clearly not being discounted or forgotten".	There is no further evidence provided in support of these statements, although from our work with the LA we are aware of its concerns regarding this issue.
Community Impact	<p>The LA consider that the impact on Sandwell communities served by the schools is as follows:</p> <p>There will not be the opportunities for more effective use of new technologies to support learning and innovation</p> <p>Post-16 provision, which forms part of vision statements and improvement plans that have been developed and agreed at both institution and pan-Sandwell level, cannot now be implemented.</p> <p>There will not be the opportunities to provide fresh solutions to longstanding challenges, such as that of improving the attendance, engagement and educational outcomes of young people at risk of falling out of the education system and of becoming vulnerable to anti-social or criminal behaviour.</p>	Some of these issues are subjective and there is insufficient evidence contained in the submission to verify the impact of the issues described.

	<p>The negative effect on the reputation of schools of national media coverage highlighting the inadequacy and poor quality of the accommodation; the increasing awareness of pupils and their families of the disparity in the quality of accommodation between their own school and those that they see being improved elsewhere, and their increasing dissatisfaction with their current accommodation as a result; the negative effect on the aspirations of pupils and on community perceptions of the value of education, when accommodation is inadequate and of poor quality – the more so since pupils have been heavily involved in planning for change and had high expectations of improvements proposed.</p>	
Regeneration Benefits to local SMEs	<p>The LA state that the LEP has truly embraced Sandwell's vision that BSF should contribute to the wider regeneration of the area; they have made a commitment to use local businesses where possible. The value of works packages awarded during the construction period of the Wave 3 projects to date within Sandwell totals some £19.89m with a further £8.08m being awarded outside of Sandwell but within the West Midlands Region. This has been a significant boost to the local economy in extremely difficult times. This investment into the local economy would not only have continued through the remainder of the Wave 3 projects but also throughout Wave 5.</p>	We are unable to either substantiate or disagree with this statement.
Deterioration of School Condition	<p>The LA state that the condition of the buildings at all of the establishments has deteriorated further since their acceptance into wave 5 of the BSF programme because the expectation was of imminent capital investment leading to significant remodelling and refurbishment; it was not considered prudent by head teachers and governing bodies to spend on improvements and maintenance that would be rendered unnecessary.</p>	We are unable to either substantiate or disagree with this statement.

## **4.**

# **Costs**

## **(Development and Contractual)**

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT COSTS						
SANDWELL						
Cost headings identified	Scope of works included in category	Overall Value £	Breakdown of quantum by category, if available (if not please record as 'N/A')	Breakdown of quantum, if available by £ (if not please record as 'N/A')	When was the cost incurred? (State as a period of time, if relevant)	Comments
Project Development Costs	<p>The LA assert that it has always worked on the basis BSF would be one continuous programme of investment across the whole of its estate and that it is difficult to identify exactly which costs are directly attributable to the development of Wave 5. Therefore, a ball park figure of 20% of the development costs expended to date has been used by them. Total development costs for 2005/06 to 2009/10 are stated in the claim as £5.3m; 20% of this figure equates to £1.06m.</p> <p>This includes;</p> <p>The preparation of:</p> <p>1) Sandwell's Secondary Education Vision across the whole estate</p> <p>2) Strategic Business Case (June 2007)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>technical assessments of the existing site conditions</li> <li>options appraisals on a site by site basis</li> <li>detailed costings to confirm affordability of the preferred options</li> </ul> <p>3) Outline Business Case Wave 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>detailed work on the affordability and Wave 5 FAM in respect of the transfer of funding between Waves</li> </ul> <p>Meeting the procurement requirements of Wave 5 projects considered and embedded throughout the Competitive Dialogue Process – with representatives from Wave 5 projects taking part in process</p> <p>Ongoing engagement with PIS, DfE and Office of Schools Commissioner in respect of the Wave 5 pre-engagement and remit stages particularly in respect of agreeing estate re-organisation models.</p> <p>Strategy for Change part 1 development (submitted Feb 10)</p> <p>Strategy for Change part 2 development (due for submission July 10)</p> <p>Considerable direct work with and by schools in developing their initial individual visions then developing further individual school SICs during SIC part 2 development.</p> <p>External advisors' costs for finance, technical and legal</p>	1,060,000	N/A - The LA has not separated out the cost of individual elements	N/A - The LA has not separated out the cost of individual elements	All Financial Years from 2005/06 to 2009/10	The information submitted does not provide an elemental cost breakdown of each aspect of the development cost and no evidence (i.e. invoices for site surveys etc.) has been provided to support the claim. The LA has stated their total expenditure over the period and attributed 20% of the cost as development cost for Wave 5.
Project running costs	Project running costs 2010/2011 of £400,000 (20% claimed)	80,000	ditto	ditto	2010/2011	It suggests, although it is not clear from the information provided, that this claim is for the entire period of 2010/11 which would include the period after the Secretary of State's announcement in July 2010
Site Investigation Surveys	In addition to the above a number of site investigation surveys have been undertaken relating to Wave 5 schools and the Collegiate Academies at a total cost of £320,000.	320,000	ditto	ditto	All Financial Years from 2005/06 to 2009/10	The Collegiate Academies (Shireland and George Salter) which are referenced are not part of this claim as they are being funded as approved projects; it is not clear from the LA submission how much of the claim relates to this aspect.

CONTRACTUAL COSTS					
SANDWELL					
Description of the contractual commitment LA has identified	Site/Issue affected (please specify by school, where possible)	Financial commitment LA sets out in its case £	Case LA makes for this being a commitment, e.g. which contract/clause does it state it relates to?	Is case supported by analysis of contracts/clauses?	Is value of contractual claim supported by evidence available in submission?
LEP Set-up costs	LA assert that the contractual position reached with the LEP at inception was predicated on receiving Wave 5 funding as they state that it is not until the wave 5 investment starts to feed through that the LEP begins to benefit from cost savings and the initial investment is recouped. This statement is supported by a letter from Sandwell Futures Ltd (LEP).	316,000	SPA. Total LEP set up costs of £632,000 were to be recovered over the lifetime of the programme. 50% from Wave 3 Phase 2 Projects and 50% from Wave 5. Sandwell are liable for the remainder of these costs (£316,000) if Wave 5 Project Agreements are not signed within a period of 5 years from Financial Close. Sandwell assert that LEP can recover these costs from Sandwell and that they (the LA) may also be liable for any interest payments on this amount.	No.	No.
Decant Costs	As above and Wave 5 sites - unspecified.	1,300,000	It was agreed between the LA and the LEP to purchase the decant facilities (temporary classrooms, etc) to be used at the [Wave 3] sample projects and then reuse them for later projects, including Wave 3 Phase 2 and Wave 5, spreading the costs accordingly. A total of £1.9m was to be split across the remaining projects. A total of £600,000 is currently covered in the Wave 3 Phase 2 projects; this leaves £1.3m that was to be recovered in Wave 5. It is uncertain at the present time if Sandwell MBC will be liable for the outstanding amount of £1.3m.	No.	No.
Contractors' Set-up costs	As above.	500,000	SPA provides that the contractors' set up costs of £2.9m (this includes £1.9m in respect of recovery of cost of decant facilities that will be used across both Wave 3 and Wave 5 - itemised under decant costs above) split 50:50 across Wave 3 and Wave 5 are recoverable from Sandwell Futures Ltd should the projects not go ahead. SFL have stated that they would make reasonable endeavours to recover these costs from Sandwell MBC. [Amount claimed: £2,900,000 - £1,900,000 / 2 = £500,000].	No.	No.

CONTRACTUAL COSTS					
Sandwell MBC Investment in LEP	As above	171,440	The LA are direct investors in the LEP and should the venture fail, assert that they stand to lose their initial investment (Equity £500; Shareholder Loan £170,940).	Based upon the bible of documents submitted to PIS at financial close (and not taking account of any subsequent changes made by the parties) the SHA (Annex 1 - Data Sheet) shows an LA investment of 500 A shares of £1 each. The Agreed business plan appended to the bible of documents provided to PIS at Sch 3 of the SHA refers to a £113,240 Shareholder Loan from the LA (part 7, page 19) rather than the figure quoted. The assertion that such amounts will be lost appears to be the conjecture of the parties.	Evidence from Sandwell Futures Ltd that the original business rationale for the establishment of the LEP was based on Wave 3 and Wave 5 developments. No direct supporting evidence as to the amounts involved is provided within claim.
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,287,440</b>			



## 5. Prioritisation

SANDWELL
Phoenix Menzies Bristnall Hall Perryfields Based on condition

## 6.

### Condition

- a. Phoenix Collegiate; North, Manor Site
- b. Phoenix Collegiate; South, Menzies Site
- c. Perryfields High School
- d. Oakham Centre, KS3 PRU
- e. Brades Lodge
- f. The Meadows
- g. The Bridge Centre
- h. Stuart Bathurst Catholic High School
- i. Wood Green High School
- j. Heathfield Foundation Technology College
- k. Bristnall Hall High School; Existing Site
- l. Bristnall Hall High School; Proposed Site at Oldbury College Lower School

a.

## **Phoenix Collegiate North, Manor Site**

**SANDWELL**  
**Phoenix Collegiate - North; Manor Site**

PfS Category	Block as per PfS	GFA/GIA	Category from LA submission	Submission as A-F	Comments
E	A	6,355	E (4)		
C	B	1,544	C (2/3)		
E	C	310	C/D (3)		
C	D	350	E (4)		
-		-			<b>Total Estimated Cost set out in LA submission £3,736,000</b>
-		-			A-E scale used in Schedule of Repairs. C - fair; D - poor; E very poor
-		-			<b>LA Condition Scale Used:</b>
-		-			1-Good - Performing as intended and operating efficiently
-		-			2-Satisfactory - Performing as intended but with minor defects
-		-			3-Poor - Exhibiting major defects and/or not operating as intended
-		-			4-Bad - Life expired and/or serious risk of failure
-		-			X-(a rating added to C or D to indicate that it is impossible to improve without replacement)

**b.**

## **Phoenix Collegiate South, Menzies Site**

149

<b>SANDWELL</b> <b>Phoenix Collegiate – South; Menzies Site, incl Sandwell CLC</b>					
PfS Category	Block as per PfS	GFA/GIA	Category from LA submission	Submission as A-F	Comments
C	A	962	B/C (3)		LA/School scale A-E is not provided; additional document provides numerical assessment (1-4) and scale replicated below from LA document.
D	B	1,716	C/D (3)		
D	C	1,392	C/D (3)		
C	D	526	D (4)		
D	E	770	C/D (3)		
D	F	566	C (4)		
D	G	326	C (4)		
D	H	716	C (3)		
E	I	518	C (4)		
C	J	647	C (4)		
C	K	1,102	C/D (3)		
C	L	2,967	B (2)		
C	M	607	B/C (3)		
C	N	417	C (4)		
-	O	-			advised G18CLC not part of the school
D	P	41			LA/School Condition assessment not provided
C	Q	122			LA/School Condition assessment not provided
A	R	82			LA/School Condition assessment not provided
E	S	60			LA/School Condition assessment not provided
-		-			<b>Total Estimated Cost set out in LA submission £3,465,000</b>
-		-			<b>LA Condition Scale Used:</b>
-		-			1-Good - Performing as intended and operating efficiently
-		-			2-Satisfactory - Performing as intended but with minor defects
-		-			3-Poor - Exhibiting major defects and/or not operating as intended
-		-			4-Bad - Life expired and/or serious risk of failure
-		-			X-(a rating added to C or D to indicate that it is impossible to improve without replacement)

**C.**

## **Perryfields High School**



**SANDWELL**  
**Perryfields High School**

PfS Category	Block as per PfS	GFA/GIA	Category from LA submission	Submission as A-F	Comments
C	A	3,972	B/C		
C	B	900			LA/School Condition assessment not provided
C	C	600			LA/School Condition assessment not provided
B	D	1,630			LA/School Condition assessment not provided
C	E	330	B/C		
C	F	604	B/C		Sports Block
B	G	120			Caretaker's House LA/School Condition assessment not provided
C	H	112			Mobile LA/School Condition assessment not provided
C	I	56			Mobile LA/School Condition assessment not provided
C	J	112			Mobile LA/School Condition assessment not provided
C	K	112			Mobile LA/School Condition assessment not provided
B	L	56			Mobile LA/School Condition assessment not provided
C	M	56			Mobile LA/School Condition assessment not provided
B	N	168			Mobile LA/School Condition assessment not provided
-		-			<b>Total Estimated Cost set out in LA submission £1,047,300</b>
-		-			<b>LA Condition Scale Used:</b>
-		-			A-Element is new and can be expected to perform adequately to its full normal life.
-		-			B-Element is sound, operationally safe, and exhibits only minor deterioration
-		-			C-Element is operational but major repair or replacement will be needed soon, that is, within 3 years for a building and 1 year for an engineering element
-		-			D-Element runs a serious risk of imminent breakdown
-		-			X-(a rating added to C or D to indicate that it is impossible to improve without replacement)

**d.**

**Oakham Centre, KS3 PRU**

**SANDWELL**  
**Oakham Centre, KS3 PRU**

PfS Category	Block as per PfS	GFA/GIA	Category from LA submission	Submission as A-F	Comments
C	A	359	B/C		
-		-			Total Estimated Cost set out in LA submission £90,778
-		-			LA Condition Scale Used:
-		-			A-Element is new and can be expected to perform adequately to its full normal life.
-		-			B-Element is sound, operationally safe, and exhibits only minor deterioration
-		-			C-Element is operational but major repair or replacement will be needed soon, that is, within 3 years for a building and 1 year for an engineering element
-		-			D-Element runs a serious risk of imminent breakdown
-		-			X-(a rating added to C or D to indicate that it is impossible to improve without replacement)

**e.**

## **Brades Lodge**

155

**SANDWELL**  
**Brades Lodge - Therapeutic Unit**

PfS Category	Block as per PfS	GFA/GIA	Category from LA submission	Submission as A-F	Comments
B	A	603	B		
-		-			Total Estimated Cost set out in LA submission £40,204
-		-			<b>LA Condition Scale Used:</b>
-		-			A-Element is new and can be expected to perform adequately to its full normal life.
-		-			B-Element is sound, operationally safe, and exhibits only minor deterioration
-		-			C-Element is operational but major repair or replacement will be needed soon, that is, within 3 years for a building and 1 year for an engineering element
-		-			D-Element runs a serious risk of imminent breakdown
-		-			X-(a rating added to C or D to indicate that it is impossible to improve without replacement)

**f.**

## **The Meadows**

157

**SANDWELL**  
**The Meadows, The Meadows Sports College**

PfS Category	Block as per PfS	GFA/GIA	Category from LA submission	Submission as A-F	Comments
B	A	3,920	B		
B	B	135	B		
-		-			<b>Total Estimated Cost set out in LA submission £92,233</b>
-		-			<b>LA Condition Scale Used:</b>
-		-			A-Element is new and can be expected to perform adequately to its full normal life.
-		-			B-Element is sound, operationally safe, and exhibits only minor deterioration
-		-			C-Element is operational but major repair or replacement will be needed soon, that is, within 3 years for a building and 1 year for an engineering element
-		-			D-Element runs a serious risk of imminent breakdown
-		-			X-(a rating added to C or D to indicate that it is impossible to improve without replacement)

## **g.**

# **The Bridge Centre**



**SANDWELL**  
**KS4 PRU, The Bridge Centre**

PfS Category	Block as per PfS	GFA/GIA	Category from LA submission	Submission as A-F	Comments
C	A	1,500	B/C		
-		-			<b>Total Estimated Cost set out in LA submission £207,300</b>
-		-			<b>LA Condition Scale Used:</b>
-		-			A-Element is new and can be expected to perform adequately to its full normal life.
-		-			B-Element is sound, operationally safe, and exhibits only minor deterioration
-		-			C-Element is operational but major repair or replacement will be needed soon, that is, within 3 years for a building and 1 year for an engineering element
-		-			D-Element runs a serious risk of imminent breakdown
-		-			X-(a rating added to C or D to indicate that it is impossible to improve without replacement)

**h.**

## **Stuart Bathurst Catholic High School**

161

**SANDWELL**  
**Stuart Bathurst Catholic High School**

PfS Category	Block as per PfS	GFA/GIA	Category from LA submission	Submission as A-F	Comments
D	A	4,768	C		
D	B	753	E		
C	C	969	B		
C	D	139			LA/School Condition assessment not provided
B	E	139			LA/School Condition assessment not provided
B	F	50			LA/School Condition assessment not provided
-	-	-			<b>Total Estimated Cost set out in LA submission £2,273,657</b>
-	-	-			<b>LA Condition Scale Used:</b>
-	-	-			A-Element is new and can be expected to perform adequately to its full normal life.
-	-	-			B-Element is sound, operationally safe, and exhibits only minor deterioration
-	-	-			C-Element is operational but major repair or replacement will be needed soon, that is, within 3 years for a building and 1 year for an engineering element
-	-	-			D-Element runs a serious risk of imminent breakdown
-	-	-			X-(a rating added to C or D to indicate that it is impossible to improve without replacement)

i.

## Wood Green High School

**SANDWELL**  
**Wood Green High School**

PfS Category	Block as per PfS	GFA/GIA	Category from LA submission	Submission as A-F	Comments
D	A	2,939	B/C		
D	B	2,393	B/C		
B	C	90	B/C		
D	D	3,058	C/B		
D	E	1,123	C/B		
B	F	1,358	B		
B	G	3,328			LA/School Condition assessment not provided
D	H	56			LA/School Condition assessment not provided
D	I	56			LA/School Condition assessment not provided
	J				Temporary building owned by Hair & Beauty service
-		-			Total Estimated Cost set out in LA submission £2,638,122
-		-			<b>LA Condition Scale Used:</b>
-		-			A-Element is new and can be expected to perform adequately to its full normal life.
-		-			B-Element is sound, operationally safe, and exhibits only minor deterioration
-		-			C-Element is operational but major repair or replacement will be needed soon, that is, within 3 years for a building and 1 year for an engineering element
-		-			D-Element runs a serious risk of imminent breakdown
-		-			X-(a rating added to C or D to indicate that it is impossible to improve without replacement)

j.

## Heathfield Foundation Technology College

165

**SANDWELL**  
**Heathfield Foundation Technical College**

PfS Category	Block as per PfS	GFA/GIA	Category from LA submission	Submission as A-F	Comments
B	A	801	B/A		
A		954	B/A		
C	B	857	B/A		
B		844	B/A		
B	C	1,479	B/A		
C	D	1,655	B/A		
B	E	3,141	B/A		
A		500	B/A		
B	F	2,846	B/A		
B	G	2,204	B/A		
B	H	112	B/A		
-		-			Total Estimated Cost set out in LA submission £431,100
-		-			LA Condition Scale Used:
-		-			A-Element is new and can be expected to perform adequately to its full normal life.
-		-			B-Element is sound, operationally safe, and exhibits only minor deterioration
-		-			C-Element is operational but major repair or replacement will be needed soon, that is, within 3 years for a building and 1 year for an engineering element
-		-			D-Element runs a serious risk of imminent breakdown
-		-			X-(a rating added to C or D to indicate that it is impossible to improve without replacement)

**k.**

**Bristnall Hall High School  
Existing Site**



**SANDWELL**  
**Bristnall Hall High School - Existing Site**

PfS Category	Block as per PfS	GFA/GIA	Category from LA submission	Submission as A-F	Comments
C	A	3,877	B		
D	B	791	B		
C	C	406	B		
D	D	1,009	B		
B	E	112	B		Mobile
-		-			<b>Total Estimated Cost set out in LA submission £1,282,720</b>
-		-			<b>Assumed that expenditure on this site will not be required if move to proposed site allowed to proceed</b>
-		-			<b>LA Condition Scale Used:</b>
-		-			A-Element is new and can be expected to perform adequately to its full normal life.
-		-			B-Element is sound, operationally safe, and exhibits only minor deterioration
-		-			C-Element is operational but major repair or replacement will be needed soon, that is, within 3 years for a building and 1 year for an engineering element
-		-			D-Element runs a serious risk of imminent breakdown
-		-			X-(a rating added to C or D to indicate that it is impossible to improve without replacement)

I.

**Bristnall Hall High School  
Proposed Site at Oldbury College  
Lower School**

169

**SANDWELL**  
**Bristnall Hall - Proposed Site**

PfS Category	Block as per PfS	GFA/GIA	Category from LA submission	Submission as A-F	Comments
C	A	626	B		
C		626	B		
D	B	708	B/C		
D	C	316	C/D		
C	D	4526	C/D		
-		-			Total Estimated Cost set out in LA submission £1,602,700
-		-			LA Condition Scale Used:
-		-			A-Element is new and can be expected to perform adequately to its full normal life.
-		-			B-Element is sound, operationally safe, and exhibits only minor deterioration
-		-			C-Element is operational but major repair or replacement will be needed soon, that is, within 3 years for a building and 1 year for an engineering element
-		-			D-Element runs a serious risk of imminent breakdown
-		-			X-(a rating added to C or D to indicate that it is impossible to improve without replacement)

## 7.

### Suitability

- a. Phoenix Collegiate; North, Manor Site
- b. Phoenix Collegiate; South, Menzies Site
- c. Perryfields High School
- d. Oakham Centre, KS3 PRU
- e. Brades Lodge
- f. The Meadows
- g. The Bridge Centre
- h. Stuart Bathurst Catholic High School
- i. Wood Green High School
- j. Heathfield Foundation Technology College
- k. Bristnall Hall High School; Existing Site
- l. Bristnall Hall High School; Proposed Site at Oldbury College Lower School

**a.**

## **Phoenix Collegiate North, Manor Site**

172

Sandwell Phoenix Collegiate North site (Manor)	
Area of the school	Comments
General Classrooms	
Science	
Maths	
English	
ICT	
DT / Art / Technology	
Music / Drama	
Hall	
Library / Resource Area	
Sports Hall	
Kitchen / Dining	
Circulation	
Hard surface play areas	
Playing field	
Car Parking	
Site	
Other area (please specify)	
TOTALS	
Non-block specific comments	
Issue	Comments
Access	CLASP buildings which because of poor construction and condition, adaptations to ensure easy mobility and access to the complete range of services have been impossible to implement.
Split Site	Makes it difficult for the school to function [effectively]
Site	Historic mining activity prevalent in the area.
Curriculum Development	Currently the buildings prevent the full implementation of the new curriculum model as we lack the specialist learning areas to support them. As the buildings are so poor we cannot make modifications to shape and size of areas severely restricting pupil access to the new curriculum choices.
Environmental	lightweight construction offers low thermal mass, consequently the environmental conditions within the buildings are extremely poor and susceptible to excessive solar gain, poor insulation, acoustics and ventilation which results in a less than adequate teaching and learning environment.
DDA	Disabled access very poor.
Specialist facilities	Poor specialist facilities (principally food technology) restricting options at Year 10.
Redevelopment Proposals	The redevelopment proposals have diminished the requirement for temporary accommodation and complex phasing requirements.
Total	

**b.**

## **Phoenix Collegiate South, Menzies Site**

174

**Sandwell  
Phoenix Collegiate South site (Menzies)**

Area of the school	Comments
General Classrooms	
Science	
Maths	
English	
ICT	
DT / Art / Technology	
Music / Drama	
Hall	
Library / Resource Area	
Sports Hall	
Kitchen / Dining	
Circulation	
Hard surface play areas	
Playing field	
Car Parking	
Site	
Other area (please specify)	
<b>TOTALS</b>	
Non-block specific comments	
Issue	Comments
Access	Access and DDA works required are expensive. Many of the buildings lack level access.
Split Site	Makes it difficult for the school to function [effectively]
Curriculum Development	Currently the buildings prevent the full implementation of the new curriculum model as we lack the specialist learning areas to support them. As the buildings are so poor we cannot make modifications to shape and size of areas severely restricting pupil access to the new curriculum choices.
Ground conditions	The School Abnormals Report in 2007 identifies a number of abnormal ground conditions.
Redevelopment Proposals	Redevelopment proposals dictate the use of temporary accommodation and extensive construction phasing requirements.
Asbestos	Likely presence of asbestos within the existing buildings.
Heating	Buildings have poor heating controls.
Total	



**c.**

## **Perryfields High School**

Sandwell Perryfields	
Area of the school	Comments
General Classrooms	Many classrooms not suited to subject style and 21st century learning and cannot be adapted further. Some classrooms can only be accessed through other teaching areas. Classrooms are undersize by current DfE standards.
Science	
Maths	
English	
ICT	
DT / Art / Technology	
Music / Drama	
Hall	
Library / Resource Area	Limited access sufficient to constitute health and fire hazard (Library/U13, Isolation).
Sports Hall	Sports hall is of flimsy construction, does not meet size recommendations, has no adjoining changing rooms and heating is inadequate. PE facilities doubling up so difficult to use at other times.
Kitchen / Dining	Eating areas crowded and overused, limited eating and social space over lunchtime because of dual use.
Circulation	Accessibility around the site and within blocks is poor. In some blocks there is a lack of fire escapes and some classrooms can only be accessed through other teaching areas. Corridors and access routes round school are a health and safety issue - narrow, low ceilings, blind corners, many levels/stairs. Circulation spaces are inadequate (tight corridors) and create flash points which are managed by one-way system on changeover of lessons as corridors are tight. On a daily basis this takes time from curriculum by making changeover longer.
Hard surface play areas	One small basketball court and caged area; increasing mobiles taking up student play areas.
Playing field	Fields unusable > 50% of the year
Car Parking	Student access around site dangerous because growing number of cars on restricted car parking space and in approach road to main entrance
Site	Lack of outside facilities, especially covered areas for socialising in poor weather; site safety compromised by lack of security system on main gate due to layout of drive, entrances/exits in and out of large number of buildings, means cannot guarantee pupil/staff safety from outsiders.
Other area (please specify)	
TOTALS	
Non-block specific comments	
Issue	Comments
DDA	Very limited access around site for disabled - not able to be an inclusive school; numerous changes in level (internal steps) within 1950s block and between each later addition, which at congested times, create significant risks for health and safety and access for students with disabilities,
14-19 Facilities (some post 16 is taught in block G which is a converted caretakers house)	Development of a full range of opportunities for the 14-19 age range, particularly the Sixth Form, including work-related learning. This is limited after failing to secure capital sixth form funding and is affecting recruitment.

<b>Specialism</b>	Better reflection of the aims and ethos of the specialism
<b>Extended Services and Community Access</b>	Extended hours learning for students, local residents and the local community is limited as access to site facilities and issues relating to security remain problems.
<b>Temporary Accommodation</b>	16 mobile classrooms (8 blocks), total floor area 1,004m <sup>2</sup> , have a negative effect on reputation, motivation and expectation for staff, pupils and parents. Significant basic need pressures with additional 45 pupils for the next 3 years requiring 4 further temporary classrooms in September 2011.
<b>Faculty Arrangements</b>	Major issues in structuring departments and the school as a cohesive unit to develop consistent teaching and learning.
<b>Specialist Provision (Ebac)</b>	Issues linked to building stock create barriers to developments including specialist provision to develop English Baccalaureate.
<b>Inclusion</b>	Inclusion centre is converted changing rooms.
<b>Exam period</b>	Lack of suitable exam space with sports hall very cold during mock exam period.
<b>Layout and size of facilities</b>	It is difficult to group faculties due to layout and growth of school and dining area is very small preventing many pupils from accessing hot food for logistical reasons i.e. Space, time and queuing arrangements.
<b>Totals</b>	

**d.**

**Oakham Centre, KS3 PRU**

**Sandwell  
Oakham Centre (KS3 PRU)**

Area of the school	Comments
<b>General Classrooms</b>	
Science	No facilities for experimentation in science which does not give the centre the opportunity to address health & safety issues relating to pupil behaviour within such an environment, which can then lead to difficulties for the pupils in the future when returning to mainstream school, resulting in permanent exclusion.
Maths	
English	
ICT	
DT / Art / Technology	No facilities for pupils to participate in the fabrication of items via design technology.
Music / Drama	
Hall	
Library / Resource Area	
Sports Hall	No facilities for pupils to shower after sport.
Kitchen / Dining	Lack of ability to provide warm food and no dining facilities.
Circulation	Unsafe for groups of pupils to move around the building at the same time due to inadequate space
Hard surface play areas	Very little useable outside space with facilities within grounds or building to offer PE or sport.
Playing field	
Car Parking	Not enough space for staff parking
Site	inability to secure grounds
Other area (please specify)	
<b>TOTALS</b>	
<b>Non-block specific comments</b>	
Issue	Comments
Interview facilities	Limited facilities for parent meetings
Storage	Storage for teaching resources is extremely limited - teachers have to store resources at home; storage space for children's ongoing learning is inadequate.
Shortage of Space	Hinders learners' personal development in fact; cramped conditions obstruct learner progress and attainment.
Access to facilities	There is a lack of access to facilities: Sport (requires transport to off-site leisure centre), design and technology, science, dining, staff work space, offices for sensitive consultations and plethora of other agencies.
<b>TOTALS</b>	

**e.**

## **Brades Lodge**

**Sandwell**  
**Brades Lodge (Therapeutic Provision)**

Area of the school	Comments
General Classrooms	
Science	
Maths	
English	
ICT	
DT / Art / Technology	
Music / Drama	
Hall	
Library / Resource Area	
Sports Hall	
Kitchen / Dining	
Circulation	
Hard surface play areas	
Playing field	
Car Parking	
Site	
Other area (please specify)	
TOTALS	
Non-block specific comments	
Issue	Comments
Expansion plans	LA advised that the changes in provision were taking place in mid 2010 and the present building was remodelled from the Special Needs contingent budget. Has planning permission for 3 additional teaching rooms, however, LA had intended for the site to be released/sold for housing development.

**f.**

## **The Meadows**

183



**Sandwell  
The Meadows Sports College**

Area of the school	Comments
General Classrooms	Classrooms too small for the increasing number of students in wheelchairs, standing frames, beds
Science	
Maths	
English	
ICT	
DT / Art / Technology	
Music / Drama	
Hall	
Library / Resource Area	
Sports Hall	
Kitchen / Dining	Dining room is too small
Circulation	
Hard surface play areas	
Playing field	
Car Parking	
Site	
Other area (please specify)	
<b>TOTALS</b>	
Non-block specific comments	
Issue	Comments
Hygiene	Not all classrooms have sinks
Changing facilities	Not enough changing areas; urgent need of full hoist tracking for wet changing rooms into the pool.
Access	Lack of independent access by students to classrooms, play etc.- classroom doors are not automatic
Storage	Serious lack of storage space, whilst this was evident in some areas during the site visit there was a large storage area that was in need of sorting/tidying.
Specialist Areas	Serious lack of specialised areas to include wet play, chilling areas, themed work etc. An extension is required to the
Environment	Extreme temperatures are an issue.
Roof construction	When it rains, the roof is very noisy which can cause behavioural issues with some students.

<b>Changing Nature of Provision</b>	<p>A new modern medical learning environment is required to enable a new way of teaching while ensuring all medical needs (including palliative care) are addressed simultaneously. Medical advances have increased survival rates in premature babies which lead to additional needs, sometimes requiring the provision offered by the school. Changes in the nature of provision due to: foetal alcohol syndrome; and palliative care which will require teaching of pupils in beds (requiring additional space). This will lead to significant pressures on storage, dining and teaching space. (see comment on space and kitchen/dining above)</p>
-------------------------------------	--

## **g.**

# **The Bridge Centre**

**Sandwell  
Bridge Centre (KS4 PRU)**

Area of the school	Comments
<b>General Classrooms</b>	
Science	No facility - Science laboratory so students can engage in actual experiments.
Maths	
English	
ICT	
DT / Art / Technology	No on site catering facility on site - provision would enable students to cook and also become business managers
Music / Drama	
Hall	
Library / Resource Area	
Sports Hall	No on-site facility - on site sports facilities to encourage physical and mental well being.
Kitchen / Dining	
Circulation	
Hard surface play areas	
Playing field	
Car Parking	
Site	Accessibility around the site is not good.
Vocational	No facility - and vocational base would ensure quality qualification outcomes.
Other area (please specify)	
<b>TOTALS</b>	
<b>Non-block specific comments</b>	
Issue	Comments
Environment (general)	The lightweight, low thermal mass of the external fabric of the building leads to poor conditions for teaching and learning. Environmental conditions within the buildings are poor and spaces are prone to excessive heat loss, overheating during the summer and poor ventilation.
DDA	The current facility is not DDA compliant.
Current Accommodation	The LA considers the current accommodation to be inappropriate and more suitable provision is sought in a light industrial setting where positive integration with the business community can provide the next step of social integration. The PRU is situated in an areas of Basic Need and shares a site with Crockets Lane Primary School as part of the site strategy was due for demolition to re-provide the primary school playing field.

**h.**

## **Stuart Bathurst Catholic High School**

**Sandwell  
Stuart Bathurst**

Area of the school	Comments
<b>General Classrooms</b>	No fit for purpose 21st Century language teaching spaces (see Access below).
<b>Science</b>	The poor state of our current science learning space will inhibit our ability to deliver the English Baccalaureate. In the Head of Science's lab the lighting is controlled at the fuse-box. There is no hot water available to any science lab or prep room.
<b>Maths</b>	low quality building with limited low density accommodation with poor environmental conditions.
<b>English</b>	
<b>ICT</b>	
<b>DT / Art / Technology</b>	low quality building with limited low density accommodation with poor environmental conditions.
<b>Music / Drama</b>	No central location for PA (specialism) curriculum
<b>Hall</b>	
<b>Library / Resource Area</b>	
<b>Sports Hall</b>	Existing location remote from main site approach (unsecure community access); no real means of heating.
<b>Kitchen / Dining</b>	
<b>Circulation</b>	
<b>Hard surface play areas</b>	
<b>Playing field</b>	
<b>Car Parking</b>	
<b>Site</b>	Significant flooding is experienced across the site, rendering the playing field out of action for significant periods of time. The site is bounded by the M6 motorway on one side and a dual carriageway on another; access to the site is a significant issue with 2 serious accidents recently. Historical activity of mine workings in the immediate area. Landfill gas is indicated on surrounding sites. There is no accessibility to emergency gas and water shut-off.
<b>Other area (please specify)</b>	
<b>TOTALS</b>	
<b>Non-block specific comments</b>	
Issue	Comments
<b>Access (DDA and Extended Services)</b>	The 4 storey tower block is currently inaccessible to pupils with mobility difficulties and there is limited access to other areas of school. In effect this causes congestion in terms of moving within the site and in terms of planning and delivery of a full curriculum. With some areas of the school being wholly inappropriate for learning whatever the nature of learning difficulties or disabilities, this result in severe congestion in the remaining parts of the building; only Catholic Secondary school in Sandwell and impacts on young persons with disabilities as unable to move with peers; school is unable to widen doorways; no access to on site provision for family learning. There are significant DDA issues with limited access across the site and this prevents disabled pupils from accessing Catholic faith education within the Borough.

<b>Environmental (pollution and ventilation)</b>	Noise and air pollution significant due to proximity of a dual carriageway and the M6 motorway; poor thermal mass determines that opening windows during summer months to permit limited ventilation exposes students to excessive noise and air pollution;
<b>Faculty Management</b>	Subject affinities to enable collaborative learning and to maximise the use of space.
<b>Total</b>	

**i.**

## **Wood Green High School**



**Sandwell  
Wood Green**

Area of the school	Comments
<b>General Classrooms</b>	Newton Block (previously Wednesbury Boy's Grammar) - built 90 years ago, sizes of the classrooms are too small for the majority of classes which makes it impossible to consider installing computers in them. None of the teaching spaces in the older block meet current space standards. There are few appropriate flexible and intelligent teaching spaces in the school for individual or large group teaching.
<b>Science</b>	
<b>Maths</b>	
<b>English</b>	
<b>ICT</b>	
<b>DT / Art / Technology</b>	Offers little quality of space
<b>Music / Drama</b>	
<b>Hall</b>	
<b>Library / Resource Area</b>	
<b>Sports Hall</b>	
<b>Kitchen / Dining</b>	School catering facilities are inadequate for numbers who could stay; inadequate canteen facilities mean a large proportion of students choose to go home and do not benefit from the lunchtime extra-curricular programme. Redgrave Hall also has to be used at lunchtimes; canteen can only seat 60 pupils (NOR c.1,450); the management of 2 large spaces in different locations is very difficult, especially during the external exam seasons.
<b>Circulation</b>	Only one of the 5 main blocks (22% of GFA) meets DDA compliance and there are further issues in Newton Block where there is a very narrow corridor on the first floor.
<b>Hard surface play areas</b>	There are no covered spaces, or spaces large enough to accommodate students at break and lunchtimes during wet weather.
<b>Playing field</b>	
<b>Car Parking</b>	
<b>Site</b>	Site has 2 entrances. One is off a dual carriageway and this poses its own safety hazards. During the day both accesses have to remain open. Intruders find it easy to access the site - students feel unsafe. St Paul's Rd separates Newton Block from the rest of the school, this is unmanageable. We have no jurisdiction over the road and who accesses it. This is a major concern. accessibility around the site is not good. The origins of the site (previously 2 schools which amalgamated in 1968) are evident to this day illustrated by St Paul's Road which still splits the school site into two zones. It is suggested this road may eventually be closed which would enable the two parts of the school to be linked. Indication of historic mine shafts and shallow workings in and around the site.
<b>Other area (please specify)</b>	
<b>TOTALS</b>	
<b>Non-block specific comments</b>	

Issue	Comments
Environment	Environmental conditions within buildings are poor and spaces are prone to effective heat loss, overheating in summer and poor ventilation. Heating systems are inefficient, inadequate; there are practically no cooling systems in place to counter-balance the problems of excessive heat generated by computers in certain classrooms. Redgrave block (glass roof) is cold in winter and unbearably hot in the summer, thus creating a totally unsuitable learning environment for pupils. Proximity of the site to the M6 motorway and a railway line creates a particular range of environmental problems: noise with no sound-proofing (except new block).
Total	

**j.**

## **Heathfield Foundation Technology College**

194

Sandwell Heathfield	
Area of the school	Comments
General Classrooms	
Science	
Maths	
English	
ICT	
DT / Art / Technology	
Music / Drama	
Hall	
Library / Resource Area	
Sports Hall	
Kitchen / Dining	
Circulation	The site is densely populated by a number of buildings which hampers mobility around the site during lesson changes.
Hard surface play areas	
Playing field	
Car Parking	
Site	The site is constrained by existing buildings, temporary accommodation.
Other area (please specify)	
TOTALS	
Non-block specific comments	
Issue	Comments
Abnormals	The Schools Abnormals Report in 2007 identifies a number of abnormal ground conditions.

**k.**

**Bristnall Hall High School  
Existing Site**

**Sandwell  
Bristnall Hall (Existing)**

Area of the school	Comments
<b>General Classrooms</b>	Existing building is not compatible with an appropriate curriculum experience, particularly, for pupils with autism. Changes to teaching styles are currently limited by the pre-WWII building.
<b>Science</b>	Science labs are on first floor and can only be reached by using a staircase
<b>Maths</b>	
<b>English</b>	
<b>ICT</b>	
<b>DT / Art / Technology</b>	
<b>Music / Drama</b>	
<b>Hall</b>	
<b>Library / Resource Area</b>	
<b>Sports Hall</b>	
<b>Kitchen / Dining</b>	Lack of onsite kitchen and dining facilities with school meals being brought in from a neighbouring school and being served in the school hall. This is a health and safeguarding concern: many learners leave the site at lunchtime. The school has not had a kitchen since 1972.
<b>Circulation</b>	Accessibility and disabled facilities are poor as the site is situated on multiple levels and consequently the school circulation is littered with numerous small staircases to overcome these level changes. The very high proportion of students who experience SEN, including those on the autistic spectrum, within the designated provision, have the greatest difficulty accessing a complete curriculum experience. The overcrowded nature of this school, let alone the multiplicity of levels means that the curriculum is limited for students who exhibit autistic tendencies.
<b>Hard surface play areas</b>	
<b>Playing field</b>	Insufficient outside sports areas with no scope for providing additional areas on the current site.
<b>Car Parking</b>	
<b>Site</b>	Overcrowded. The existing site is insufficient to accommodate the current NOR.
<b>Other area (please specify)</b>	
<b>TOTALS</b>	
<b>Non-block specific comments</b>	
Issue	Comments
<b>Toilets</b>	Pressure on toilet facilities for staff and pupils are acute eg. There are 139 female staff with only 4 toilet cubicles.
<b>Staff room</b>	The school has now given up its staff room facilities.
<b>Access and behaviour</b>	There is poor disabled access across the site and the cramped conditions impact on pupil behaviour.

# I.

## **Bristnall Hall High School Proposed Site at Oldbury College Lower School**

**Sandwell  
Bristnall Hall (Proposed)**

Area of the school	Comments
General Classrooms	
Science	
Maths	
English	
ICT	
DT / Art / Technology	
Music / Drama	
Hall	
Library / Resource Area	
Sports Hall	
Kitchen / Dining	
Circulation	
Hard surface play areas	
Playing field	
Car Parking	
Site	
<i>Other area (please specify)</i>	
<b>TOTALS</b>	
<b>Non-block specific comments</b>	
Issue	Comments
Proposal	Similar issues would pertain on this site (as the existing Bristnall Hall site) on a like-for-like basis but the LA's proposal would be to demolish poor accommodation, remodel and provide additional accommodation if the school were to move to this site.



## 8.

### Appendix

### PfS Condition Assessments

200

- a. Phoenix Collegiate - (North) Manor Site
- b. Phoenix Collegiate - (South) Menzies Site
- c. Perryfields High School
- d. Oakham Centre KS3 PRU
- e. Brades Lodge
- f. The Meadows
- g. The Bridge Centre
- h. Stuart Bathurst Catholic High School
- i. Wood Green High School
- j. Heathfield Foundation Technology College
- k. Bristnall Hall High School (Existing)
- l. Bristnall Hall High School (Proposed at Oldbury College Lower School)

**a.**

**Phoenix Collegiate  
North, Manor Site**

201

School Name	Phoenix Collegiate - (North) Manor Site			
Local Authority	Sandwell	Date of visit	28/03/2011	
Meeting attended by	PFS: Paul Adam, Richard Malyon School: I. Moreton (deputy head), Keith Bunce LA: Paul Piddock, Gary Berridge, John Parry			
Current NOR	1649 + 402 sixth form across Phoenix Collegiate sites	Proposed NOR	1800 + 260 sixth form across Phoenix Collegiate sites	
Existing GFA	8559 (Gross Internal Area)	Required GFA		
1. Condition of existing buildings				
Reference	Approx. Age / Block type	Gross Floor Area m2	Condition Category	Comments, Risks, Issues
1.1 Block A	1968 three, two and one storey CLASP steel framed construction in several blocks with flat roofs.	6355	E	Main Blocks. Buildings are generally in a very poor, run down state. Flat roofs commonly leak throughout many of the CLASP buildings. Primarily original single glazing often suffering from serious failure; some windows replaced with plastic as rotting frames will not hold glass. Asbestos is prevalent and prevents maintenance, repair or improvement of much of the structure and services; it was reported to be loose and collect in voids. Mechanical and electrical infrastructure is generally serviceable through becoming obsolete; electrics in the art block regularly fails. Heating controls are a significant problem in many areas. The boiler chimney ladder appears to be a serious health and safety concern with no safety cage and rotates in wind. Fire regulations cannot be met due to asbestos. Isolated areas have virtually been condemned as they cannot comply with their intended use e.g. cooking classroom. Most areas are in poor decoration, though there are areas which have been superficially modernise.
1.2 Block B	1990 steel framed sports hall and gym.	1544	C	Sports Block. Poor floor with patch repairs, lighting partially improved but further improvement in gym required.
1.3 Block C	1980's Lightweight timber frame, with limited brick facade.	310	E	Performing Arts. Low specification building, primarily single glazed. Much evidence of rot to exterior. Some superficial modernisation internally.
1.4 Block D	1992 Lightweight steel framed infill extension.	350	C	Woodwork. Fair accommodation, but relies on neighbouring CLASP buildings for support to either side. Poor floor surfaces.

## **2. Relevant site specific issues (levels, known ground condition issues, planning restrictions e.g. green belt, etc.)**

### **Background**

A mixed secondary school with 6th form. Pupil numbers are reducing with current Y7 at 2 FE on this site; Headteacher advised that whilst there are community cohesion issues (there was extensive debate on this when the 2-site solution was approved by Ministers, prior to submission of SfC2) he was consulting governors on the gradual withdrawal from the site with integration transfer of pupils to the South (Menzies) site, principally due to financial viability of the learning and teaching arrangements.

### **1) Ground conditions**

- Historic mining activity prevalent in the area

### **2) Other issues**

The school requested that note be taken of the following issues, although it was explained that the majority relate to suitability, which is not the subject of this assessment. Such issues as:

- Poor specialist facilities (principally food technology) restrict options at Y10.
- Disabled access very poor.
- Redevelopment proposals have diminished the requirement for temporary accommodation and complex construction phasing requirements

**b.**

## **Phoenix Collegiate South, Menzies Site**

204

School Name	Phoenix Collegiate - (South) Menzies Site			
Local Authority	Sandwell	Date of visit	28/03/2011	
Meeting attended by	PIS: Paul Adam, Richard Malyon School: Keith Bunce, Gary Hill LA: Paul Piddock, Gary Berridge			
Current NOR	1649 + 402 place sixth form across Phoenix Collegiate sites	Proposed NOR	1800 + 260 place sixth form across Phoenix Collegiate sites	
Existing GFA	14363 ( Gross Internal Area)	Required GFA		
1. Condition of existing buildings				
Reference	Approx. Age / Block type	Gross Floor Area m2	Condition Category	Comments, Risks, Issues
1.1 Block A	1960's two storey concrete framed, brick clad structure and hall (steel framed roof) and CLASP type steel framed construction extension at first floor only. All flat roofed.	962	C	Admin and Main Hall - Single glazing in reasonable condition. Reports of isolated water ingress, asbestos and heating control issues. Unusual CLASP type extension in reasonable condition.
1.2 Block B	1960's two and four storey concrete framed, brick clad structure with flat roof.	1716	D	Maths Block and Dining - Metal single glazing in poor condition, flat roofs in poor condition and causing water ingress issues.
1.3 Block C	1960's two and four storey concrete framed, brick clad structure with flat roof.	1392	D	English and Art - Metal single glazing in poor condition, flat roofs in poor condition and causing water ingress issues.
1.4 Block D	1960's two storey CLASP type steel framed construction with flat roof.	526	C	MFL - Poor accommodation internally. Recently re-roofed and original glazing replaced with double glazing. NB Neighbouring block of same construction/condition recently suffered serious structural failure.
1.5 Block E	1960's two storey concrete framed, brick clad structure with flat roof.	770	D	Science - Metal single glazing in poor condition. Reported problems with fire separation above voids.
1.6 Block F	1960's two storey CLASP type steel framed construction with flat roof.	566	D	Science - Poor accommodation internally. Recently re-roofed though with remaining water ingress issues and original glazing replaced with double glazing. Recently suffered serious structural failure with façade becoming detached.
1.7 Block G	1960's single storey steel framed, brick clad structure with flat roof.	326	D	Science - Metal single glazing in poor condition. Humid, water ingress issues, flat roof in poor condition.
1.8 Block H	1960's single storey steel framed, brick and sheet clad structure with flat roof.	716	D	Gyms - Metal single glazing in poor condition. Water ingress issues, flat roof in poor condition. Sanitary fittings not in use due to failure.
1.9 Block I	1960's single storey CLASP type steel framed construction with flat roof.	518	E	Resistant Materials - Evidence of structural failure to external wall; single glazed, failing flat roof, poor electrics, overheats.
1.10 Block J	1960's single storey CLASP type steel framed construction with flat roof.	647	C	Library - dated but pleasant and flexible interior with plenty of natural lights, single glazing in poor condition. Overheats.
1.11 Block K	Single storey steel framed, brick and sheet clad structure with flat roof.	1102	C	5 court Sports Hall - Changing is in poor condition and suffers drainage /sewerage problems otherwise in fair condition.

<b>1. Condition of existing buildings</b>				
Reference	Approx. Age / Block type	Gross Floor Area m2	Condition Category	Comments, Risks, Issues
1.12 Block L	1997 3 storey concrete framed, brick clad with shallow pitched roof	2967	C	Humanities and Business Studies - Modern accommodation but with some significant issues. Reported fire regulation issues - no separation above voids, double glazed units do not function well, being very difficult to open. Has heating/cooling issues.
1.13 Block M	Single storey steel framed, brick clad structure with flat roof.	607	C	Music and Drama - mix of single and double glazing. Some water ingress issues.
1.14 Block N	1960's single storey CLASP type steel framed construction with flat roof.	417	C	Post 16 - recently refurbished superficially, but hides aging structure with single glazing in poor condition. Overheats.
1.15 Block O				CLC - advised not to be part of school. 826m2
1.16 Block P	Mobile	41	D	Assumed to be Block D mobile. Double glazed, but poor exterior cladding.
1.17 Block Q	Mobile	122	C	Assumed to be Block B mobile. Double glazed.
1.18 Block R	Mobile	82	A	Assumed to be red sports hall mobile - brand new.
1.19 Block S	Mobile	60	E	Assumed to be Vocational Education. Double glazed, but failing door frame and exterior cladding.
<b>2. Relevant site specific issues (levels, known ground condition issues, planning restrictions e.g. green belt, etc.)</b>				
<p><b>Background</b>  A 2000 place 11-18 secondary school. The Headteacher advised that whilst there are community cohesion issues (there was extensive debate on this when the 2-site solution was approved, prior to submission of SFC2) he was consulting governors on the gradual integration and transfer of pupils from the South (Menzies) site, principally due to financial viability of the learning and teaching arrangements. There is a CLC on site in good condition which the LA will consider making available to the school when central CLC revenue funding ceases in the next financial year.</p> <p><b>1) Ground conditions</b>  The School Abnormals Report in 2007 identifies a number of abnormal ground condition</p> <p><b>2) Site levels</b>  Many of the buildings lack level access</p> <p><b>3) Other issues</b>  The school requested that note be taken of the following issues, although it was explained that the majority relate to suitability, which is not the subject of this assessment. Such issues as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Redevelopment proposals dictate the use of temporary accommodation and extensive construction phasing requirements</li> <li>- Likely presence of asbestos within the existing buildings</li> <li>- Buildings have poor heating controls</li> </ul>				

**C.**

## **Perryfields High School**



<b>School Name</b>	Perryfields High School		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Sandwell	<b>Date of visit</b>	29/03/2011
<b>Meeting attended by</b>	PIS: Paul Adam, Richard Malyon School: Di Meredith, Chris Lee LA: Pete Cole, Gary Berridge		
<b>Current NOR</b>	1084 + 80 place sixth form	<b>Proposed NOR</b>	1200 + 150 place sixth form
<b>Existing GFA</b>	8628 (Gross Internal Area)	<b>Required GFA</b>	
<b>1. Condition of existing buildings</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Approx. Age / Block type</b>	<b>Gross Floor Area m2</b>	<b>Condition Category</b>
1.1 Block A	1957 two and single storey, concrete framed, resin/aggregate panel clad, with flat roof.	3972	C
1.2 Block B	1971 two and three storey concrete framed and panel clad with flat roof.	900	C
1.3 Block C	1980's two storey brick with flat roof	600	C
1.4 Block D	2006 two storey steel framed, brick clad, pitched roof.	1630	B
1.5 Block E	1960's or 1970's single storey traditional brick and block construction with flat roof and lightweight steel framed roof over drama.	330	C
1.6 Block F	Steel framed, profiled cladding, pitched roof.	604	C
1.7 Block G	1960's caretaker's house with 2009 refurbishment and conservatory extension.	120	B
1.8 Block H	1980's mobile classroom	112	C
1.9 Block I	1980's mobile classroom	56	C
1.10 Block J	1990's mobile classroom	112	C
repeat as necessary....	1980's mobile classroom	112	C
	2006 mobile classroom	56	B
	1990's mobile classroom	56	C
	2009 mobile classroom	168	B
<b>2. Relevant site specific issues (levels, known ground condition issues, planning restrictions e.g. green belt, etc.)</b>			
<p><b>Background</b></p> <p>A 1165 place secondary school with a sixth form. School originally part of W3 but swapped with another school. Maths and Computing specialism providing outreach to other Sandwell schools. Post 16 facilities are poor (converted caretakers house) and this presents problems for recruitment of staff for post 16 and retention of pupils into the 6th form. School originally built for 5/600 pupils with current (11-16) NOR 1084; this is causing pressure on specialist facilities and reducing access to certain option choices at KS4.</p> <p><b>Wider implications of basic need</b></p> <p>Significant basic need pressures with additional 45 pupils for next 3 years requiring 4 further temporary classrooms in September 2011.</p> <p><b>Other issues</b></p> <p>The school requested that note be taken of the following issues, although it was explained that the majority relate to suitability, which is not the subject of this assessment. Such issues as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- School has particularly narrow corridors which cause significant pupil movement issues and whilst school operates a one-way system this requires extensive 'management' by the SLT.</li> <li>- Lack of suitable exam space with sports hall very cold during mock exam period.</li> <li>- It is difficult to group faculties due to layout and growth of school and dining area is very small preventing many pupils from accessing hot food for logistical reasons i.e. space, time and queuing arrangements.</li> </ul>			

**d.**

**Oakham Centre, KS3 PRU**

<b>School Name</b>	Oakham Centre KS3 PRU		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Sandwell	<b>Date of visit</b>	29/03/2011
<b>Meeting attended by</b>	Paul Adam, Richard Malyon School Carolyn Hill (head) LA: Pete Cole, Gary Smith		
<b>Current NOR</b>	19	<b>Proposed NOR</b>	20
<b>Existing GFA</b>	359 (Gross Internal Area)	<b>Required GFA</b>	
<b>1. Condition of existing buildings</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Approx. Age / Block type</b>	<b>Gross Floor Area m2</b>	<b>Condition Category</b>
1.1 Block A	Late 1980's single storey traditional brick / block construction with pitched roof.	359	C
1.2 Block B	Caretaker's store.		
<b>2. Relevant site specific issues (levels, known ground condition issues, planning restrictions e.g. green belt, etc.)</b>			
<b>Background</b>			
This is a Key Stage 3 PRU for the West Collaborative with strong link with Ormiston Sandwell Community Academy where it was proposed that the PRU would move. The school caters for pupils on a 6-day+ exclusion for maximum of 2 terms. The Headteacher advised that the building is an ex-community centre, adjoining a primary school which presents pupil management issues. Equality is seen to be an issue as it will be the only KS3 PRU not located on a mainstream site.			
<b>Site</b>			
There is a lack of access to facilities: Sport (requires transport to off-site leisure centre), design and technology, science, dining, staff work space, offices for sensitive consultations and plethora of other agencies.			

**e.**

## **Brades Lodge**

211

<b>School Name</b>	Brades Lodge		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Sandwell	<b>Date of visit</b>	29/03/2011
<b>Meeting attended by</b>	P/S: Paul Adam, Richard Malyon School: Steve Butt, Karen Deakin LA: Pete Cole, Gary Smith		
<b>Current NOR</b>	15	<b>Proposed NOR</b>	22
<b>Existing GFA</b>	603 (Gross Internal Area)	<b>Required GFA</b>	
<b>1. Condition of existing buildings</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Approx. Age / Block type</b>	<b>Gross Floor Area m2</b>	<b>Condition Category</b>
1.1 Block A	1970's single storey traditional brick / block construction with pitched roof around courtyard	603	B
<b>Comments, Risks, Issues</b>			
Full refurbishment completed in September 2010. Some lighting not modernised. Some windows remain single glazed.			
<b>2. Relevant site specific issues (levels, known ground condition issues, planning restrictions e.g. green belt, etc.)</b>			
<b>Background</b>			
Caters for 20 complex emotionally disturbed pupils on a day basis. Executive Headteacher advised that he was in dispute with the LA over the nature of provision and that the unit was now part of Shenstone Lodge (school) which is situated in Lichfield, some 12 miles away. The DfE number is now 3337001. The LA advised that the changes in provision were taking place in mid 2010 and the present building was remodelled from the Special Needs contingent budget. Has planning permission for 3 additional teaching rooms, however LA had intended for the site to be released/ sold for housing development.			

**f.**

## **The Meadows**

<b>School Name</b>	The Meadows		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Sandwell	<b>Date of visit</b>	29/03/2011
<b>Meeting attended by</b>	PFS: Paul Adam, Richard Malyon School: Gordon Phillips, Melissa Walsh LA: Pete Cole, Gary Smith		
<b>Current NOR</b>	60 + 48 place sixth form	<b>Proposed NOR</b>	75 + 60 place sixth form
<b>Existing GFA</b>	5055 (Gross Internal Area)	<b>Required GFA</b>	
<b>1. Condition of existing buildings</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Approx. Age / Block type</b>	<b>Gross Floor Area m2</b>	<b>Condition Category</b>
1.1 Block A	2003 single storey steel framed, brick clad with pitched system roof and polycarbonate barrel roof around courtyard.	3920	B
1.2 Block B	2005 wooden shed clad in brick with pitched tile roof.	135	B
<b>2. Relevant site specific issues (levels, known ground condition issues, planning restrictions e.g. green belt, etc.)</b>			
<b>Background</b> This is a 108 place LA maintained 11-19 Special School. The school is due to receive a 20% increase in pupils due to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased number of pupils at the feeder primary special school (The Orchard).</li> <li>2. Medical advances have increased survival rates in premature babies which lead to additional needs, sometimes requiring the provision offered by the school.</li> <li>3. Changes in the nature of provision due to:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Foetal Alcohol syndrome</li> <li>- Palliative care which will require teaching of pupils in beds (requiring additional space)</li> </ul> </li> </ol> This will lead to significant pressures on storage, dining and teaching space.			

## **g.**

# **The Bridge Centre**



<b>School Name</b>	The Bridge Centre		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Sandwell	<b>Date of visit</b>	07/04/2011
<b>Meeting attended by</b>	PFS: Paul Adam; Richard Malyon School: June Smart (Head of PRU), Barry Yeomans (Director), Hadley Industries (Member of PRU Management Committee) LA: Mark Peate, Gary Berridge, Pete Cole		
<b>Current NOR</b>	80 + 48 Post 16	<b>Proposed NOR</b>	75 + 60 Post 16
<b>Existing GFA</b>	approx 1500	<b>Required GFA</b>	
<b>1. Condition of existing buildings</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Approx. Age / Block type</b>	<b>Gross Floor Area m2</b>	<b>Condition Category</b>
1.1 Block A	1970's? one and two storey traditional brick / block and concrete framed with panel system cladding with flat roof.	c1500?	C
1.2 Block B			Small storage shed.
<b>2. Relevant site specific issues (levels, known ground condition issues, planning restrictions e.g. green belt, etc.)</b>			
<b>Background</b> This provides a Borough-wide 'alternative' education for circa 52 pupils whom rarely return to mainstream provision. The provision is heavily vocational and for some pupils includes, for example, restorative justice for some. The current accommodation is deemed to be inappropriate by the LA and more suitable provision is sought in a light industrial setting where positive integration with the business community can provide the next step of social integration. The PRU is situated in an area of Basic Need and shares a site with Crockets Lane Primary School and as part of the site strategy was due for demolition to re-provide the primary school playing field. The current facility is not DDA compliant.			

**h.**

**Stuart Bathurst Catholic High School**

School Name	Stuart Bathurst Catholic High School			
Local Authority	Sandwell	Date of visit	07/04/2011	
Meeting attended by	PIS: Paul Adam, Richard Malyon			
Current NOR	816	Proposed NOR	874	
Existing GFA	6818 (Gross Internal Area)	Required GFA		
1. Condition of existing buildings				
Reference	Approx. Age / Block type	Gross Floor Area m2	Condition Category	Comments, Risks, Issues
1.1 Block A	1965 four, two and single storey building with extensive 1969 two and single storey extension partly supported over existing structure. All concrete framed with flat roofs and range of brick and panel cladding.	4768	D	Main Building - four storey tower leaning slightly away from two storey structure and suffers from water ingress through 'porous walls'. 1969 building suffering from serious spalling to concrete frame revealing reinforcement. Legionella issues with dead legs; asbestos generally managed. Water ingress throughout much of the main building. Boilers are 27 years old (1984); heating is described as very inefficient; there is no hot water to most of the 1965 extension. Electrics are very dated, particularly in science labs where lighting is controlled from fuse boards. Most labs have non compliant gas shutoff. Water tanks advised as needing replacement. Primarily double glazed. Some limited areas have been modernised; though primarily ageing surfaces. One lift provides very limited access to first floor only. Significant DDA issues.
1.2 Block B	1970's steel framed sports hall and library with brick and corrugated panels with pitched and flat roof.	753	D	Sports Block - heating and lighting in poor condition; concrete floor lifting; cracking to lintel evident.
1.3 Block C	1970's single storey steel framed, brick and panel clad, flat roof	969	C	Music / Craft Block - asbestos window cills and lagging; boilers approaching obsolescence. Double glazed. Generally modernised internally, but infrastructure poorer.
1.4 Block D	2000 mobile	139	C	Mobile
1.5 Block E	2009 mobile	139	B	Mobile
1.6 Block F	Bungalow	c50	B	SEN - Caretakers home converted 3 years ago for SEN.

## **2. Relevant site specific issues (levels, known ground condition issues, planning restrictions e.g. green belt, etc.)**

### **Background**

This is a 816 Catholic High School.

### **1) Ground conditions**

Significant flooding is experienced across the site, rendering the playing field out of action for significant periods of time.

### **2) Site**

The site is bound by the M6 motorway on one side and a dual carriageway on another; access to the site is a significant issue with 2 serious accidents recently. Historical activity of mine workings in the immediate area. Landfill gas is indicated on surrounding sites. Close proximity of the school to the M6 motorway and a main dual carriageway may require abnormal acoustic measures to the buildings.

### **3) Other issues**

The school requested that note be taken of the following issues, although it was explained that the majority relate to suitability, which is not the subject of this assessment. Such issues as:

- It is reported that no accessible to emergency gas and water shut-off. In the Head of Science's lab the lighting is controlled at the fuse-box. There is no hot water available to any science lab or prep room.

There are significant DDA issues with limited access across the site and this prevents disabled pupils from accessing Catholic faith education within the Borough.

i.

## Wood Green High School

School Name	Wood Green High School			
Local Authority	Sandwell	Date of visit	07/04/2011	
Meeting attended by	PIS: Paul Adam, Richard Malyon LA: Paul Piddock, Gary Berridge School: Pank Patel (Principal), Caretaker			
Current NOR	1369	Proposed NOR	1490	
Existing GFA	14401 (Gross Internal Area)	Required GFA		
1. Condition of existing buildings				
Reference	Approx. Age / Block type	Gross Floor Area m2	Condition Category	Comments, Risks, Issues
1.1 Block A	1926 and 1932 two and single storey traditional brick and pitched roof with 1957 two and single storey steel framed extension with flat roof.	2939	D	Pritchard Building - asbestos present in all elements in 1957 building. Primarily single glazed. Water ingress from roofs and rain flooding. Internal drainage down pipes cause leak. Some evidence of serious cracking to floor and stairs; glazed ceiling has collapsed on a couple of occasions. Balustrade failing in stairs. Floor surfaces rippling. Heating ineffective with poor controls. Elements are poorly insulated.
1.2 Block B	1970's single and two storey steel framed with mixed brick and panel cladding and flat roofs.	2393	D	Tech / Admin - primarily poor single glazing with rotting cills in places; hot water on only with heating; boilers becoming obsolete; flat roofs recently replaced; asbestos reasonably widespread; electrics and lighting generally dated; finishes generally poor. Some parts have been modernised.
1.3 Block C	1960's? traditional two storey ex caretaker's house.	90	B	LSU
1.4 Block D	1950's single and two storey traditional brick and steel framed with mixed brick, timber and panel cladding and flat roofs. Relatively small 1970's extension.	3058	D	Lloyd Block - very poor single glazed and fibre glass panel elevations; finishes are generally poor; reported subsidence issues (some underpinning reported to have taken place); original electrics (apart from catering) and mechanical services; heating control issues; some flat roofs have been replaced recently. Asbestos throughout block. Flooding suffered regularly due to rain collection.
1.5 Block E	1950's two storey steel framed with mixed brick and panel cladding and flat roofs.	1123	D	Lloyd Science Block - very poor single glazed and fibre glass panel elevations; finishes are generally poor, though some areas have been modernised; original electrics and mechanical infrastructure; heating control issues. Sky lights suffer from water ingress. Asbestos throughout block. Foul drains are reported as inadequate.
1.6 Block F	1995 and 2007 steel framed sports halls and gym/changing.	1358	B	Sports Hall - wear and tear in places.
1.7 Block G	2007 three storey steel framed, brick and rendered panels, with flat roof.	3328	B	New Block.

1. Condition of existing buildings				
Reference	Approx. Age / Block type	Gross Floor Area m2	Condition Category	Comments, Risks, Issues
1.8 Block H	1995 mobile with shallow pitched roof.	56	D	Temporary structure, double glazed, deteriorating exterior, heating issues and water ingress.
1.9 Block I	1997 mobile with flat roof.	56	D	Temporary structure, double glazed, deteriorating exterior, heating issues and water ingress.
1.10 Block J				Further temporary building owned by hair and beauty service.
2. Relevant site specific issues (levels, known ground condition issues, planning restrictions e.g. green belt, etc.)				
<p><b>Background</b>  A 1370 11-18 place high school. Recent Academy Converter, over-subscribed with increased retention in 6th form recently, partly due to provision of some new facilities. Wood Green High School was formed in 1968 by the amalgamation of Wednesbury Boy's High School (1924 Prichard Block) and Wood Green County Secondary Modern School (1963 Lloyd Blocks) as a specialist Sports, Maths and Computing College. The origins of the site are evident to this day illustrated by St Paul's Road which still splits the school site into two zones. It was suggested that this road may eventually be closed which would enable the two parts of the school to be linked. The original school buildings were supplemented with a new Admin and Technology Block shortly after amalgamation. More recently a Sports Hall and a new teaching block, the Hughes block have been added</p> <p><b>1) Ground conditions</b>  Indication of historic mine shafts and shallow workings in and around the site.</p> <p><b>2) Site</b>  Proximity of the M6 motorway and a main dual carriageway may require additional acoustic measures.</p>				

j.

## Heathfield Foundation Technology College

223



School Name	Heathfield Foundation Technology College			
Local Authority	Sandwell	Date of visit	08/04/2011	
Meeting attended by	PIS: Paul Adam, Richard Malyon LA: Paul Piddock, Gary Berridge School: Mr JB Parker (head), Stuart Adams (deputy), Roger and Janet (site managers)			
Current NOR	1735	Proposed NOR	1740	
Existing GFA	15393 (Gross Internal Area)	Required GFA		
1. Condition of existing buildings				
Reference	Approx. Age / Block type	Gross Floor Area m2	Condition Category	Comments, Risks, Issues
1.1 Block A	1972 single storey concrete framed building with concrete panels.	801	B	Block 1 - double glazed in 2009; mix of worn finishes and modernised areas.
	2008 independently steel frame supported structure at first floor with shallow pitch roof.	954	A	Block 1 - one truss has settled, but no significant defects.
1.2 Block B	1973 single storey concrete framed building with concrete panels.	857	C	Block 2 - double glazed in 2009; primarily not modernised internally.
	2005 independently steel frame supported structure at first floor with shallow pitch roof.	844	B	Block 2
1.3 Block C	1974 two storey concrete framed building with concrete panels and flat roof.	1479	B	Block 3 - double glazed, very well maintained, some superficial wear and tear.
1.4 Block D	1974 two storey concrete framed building with concrete panels and flat roof.	1655	C	Block 4 - double glazed, very well maintained, some worn finishes. Sort isolated evidence of water ingress from sky lights; asbestos in panels is managed; panel heating not effective to all rooms.
1.5 Block E	1987 two and single traditional brick / block with pitched roof, concrete floor and brick sports hall and gym with timber beams.	3141	B	Block 5 - Well maintained aluminium single glazed. M&E services work well.
	2010 two storey steel framed extension with shallow pitched roof.	c500	A	Post 16
1.6 Block F	1995-8 two and single storey traditional brick / block with pitched roof.	2846	B	Block 6 & 7 - some deteriorating finishes.
1.7 Block G	2000-2002 two and single storey traditional brick / block with pitched roof.	2204	B	Block 8, 9 & 10 - some deteriorating finishes and isolated incidents of water ingress.
1.8 Block H	2005 single storey brick with steel framed steel barrel roof.	112	B	Sports Pavilion - water ingress; but primary issue is security, isolation and vandalism
2. Relevant site specific issues (levels, known ground condition issues, planning restrictions e.g. green belt, etc.)				
Background This is a 1735 11-18 technology college.				
1) Ground conditions The School's Abnormals Report in 2007 identifies a number of abnormal ground conditions				
2) Constrained site The site is constrained by existing buildings, temporary accommodation.				

**k.**

**Bristnall Hall High School  
Existing Site**

225

<b>School Name</b>	Bristnall Hall High School (Existing)		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Sandwell	<b>Date of visit</b>	08/04/2011
<b>Meeting attended by</b>	PIS: Paul Adam, Richard Malyon LA: Paul Piddock, John Parry School: Steve Vendross (head), Pete Rose		
<b>Current NOR</b>	938	<b>Proposed NOR</b>	
<b>Existing GFA</b>	6195 (Gross Internal Area)	<b>Required GFA</b>	
<b>1. Condition of existing buildings</b>			
<b>Reference</b>	<b>Approx. Age / Block type</b>	<b>Gross Floor Area m2</b>	<b>Condition Category</b>
1.1 Block A	1928, 1950's, 1960's and 1970's single storey with two storey elements, traditional brick with mix of pitched and flat roofs. Small steel framed art area.	3877	C
1.2 Block B	1930's and 1976 single and two storey lightweight steel framed brick clad with mix of pitched and flat roof	791	D
1.3 Block C	1930's two storey brick with pitched roof	406	C
1.4 Block D	1976 two storey concrete framed, brick clad, flat roof	1009	D
1.5 Block E	2009 mobile	c112	B
<b>2. Relevant site specific issues (levels, known ground condition issues, planning restrictions e.g. green belt, etc.)</b>			
<p><b>Background</b>          This is a 938 place school. The current site and buildings were designed for 500 pupils and with additional temporary facilities are sufficient in size to accommodate a school with a number on roll of 650 only (current NOR 938); the proposed relocation of the school to the Oldbury 'surplus' site has a projected pupil number of 1,291 due to basic need pressure. This increase in pupil numbers on that site will require a substantial area of new build. The school has 30 pupils with a statement of SEN and has approx 4-5% above SEN generally; the staff room was recently turned into an autism base to provide for the statemented pupils.</p> <p><b>1) Constrained site</b>          The existing site is insufficient to accommodate the current roll. The LA's [BSF] proposal was to move to a new site presently occupied by Oldbury school operating a split-site arrangement until the conclusion of that school's Wave 3 project which is currently on-site.</p> <p><b>2) Other issues</b>          The school requested that note be taken of the following issues, although it was explained that the majority relate to suitability, which is not the subject of this assessment. Such issues as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- pressure on toilet facilities for staff and pupils are acute e.g. there are 139 female staff with only 4 toilet cubicles.</li> <li>- The school has not had a kitchen since 1972 and has now given up its staffroom facilities.</li> <li>- There is poor disabled access across the site and the cramped conditions impact on pupil behaviour.</li> </ul>			

I.

**Bristnall Hall High School  
Proposed Site at Oldbury College  
Lower School**

227