

## A Review of Methodology for Estimating Demand for Education Provision Arising From New Housing Developments

To: Children and Young People Committee

Meeting Date: 28<sup>th</sup> November 2023

From: Executive Director: Children, Education and Families

Electoral division(s): All

Key decision: No

Forward Plan ref: n/a

Outcome: Councillors will:

- a) have a clear understanding of the purpose of child yield multipliers, how they are derived and the use to which they are put in planning education provision so that the Council meets its statutory place planning duties whilst minimising risk
- b) be able to approve the adoption of the revised child multipliers with immediate effect.

Recommendation: The Committee is recommended to approve the adoption of the revised child multipliers set out in Table 3 in paragraph 2.8 and Table 5 in paragraph 2.11 with immediate effect to better inform the planning and funding of early years and school places.

Officer contacts:

Name: Fran Cox

Post: Assistant Director: Education Capital and Place Planning

Email: [fran.cox@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:fran.cox@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)

Tel: 01480 379582

Leigh Roberts

Research Team Manager

[leigh.roberts@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:leigh.roberts@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)

07770 282122

# 1. Background

- 1.1 The Council is responsible for planning, reviewing and commissioning educational services, including new schools. It has a statutory duty to provide a school place for every child living in its area of responsibility who is of school age and whose parents want their child to be educated in the state funded sector. In addition, the Council has a responsibility to provide sufficient early years and childcare provision.
- 1.2 In order to inform and plan appropriately for early education and school places in response to new housing developments, the Council requires forecasts of likely numbers of children who will live in those developments. The planned response to larger developments usually involves the establishment of new schools and sufficient land to accommodate buildings and outdoor space. These requirements feed into the planning process and form the basis either for negotiation with developers as part of a S106 Agreement or to support the Council's case for its infrastructure requirements to be funded via the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
- 1.3 The multipliers used to forecast the numbers of children for a given number of new homes were last revised and approved by Children & Young People's (CYP) Committee in December 2017. As a result of the previous review:
  - the general multiplier for the primary age range (age 4 to 10) was increased from 25-35 per 100 dwellings to 30-40; and
  - the detailed multiplier was reduced for the number of children expected to live in 3 and 4- bedroom market properties but increased for the number in social-rented properties.
- 1.4 Given the current and projected level of growth in the County a review of the multipliers is recommended to take place every three to five years. In June 2021 CYP Spokes agreed to delaying a full review of child yield multipliers until 2021 census data became available.
- 1.5 The monitoring of recent new developments in Cambridgeshire suggests that the general multipliers for primary-aged children and some of the detailed multipliers needed to be reviewed again. This paper sets out the reasons for, and outcome of this latest revision.

# 2. Main Issues

## 2.1 Methodology

Forecasting the number of children that will live in a new development is a complex, evidence-led process. The Council's Business Intelligence Service (BIS) has developed a methodology over many years, based on:

- analyses of school census data
- local surveys of new developments
- whole population analysis such as local population estimates and, where relevant the national census and GP registrations

This data is then applied to a selection of recent case studies for new developments in the area. In this case, Alconbury Weald and Northstowe.

2.2 In August 2023, the Department for Education published updated guidance for local authorities on securing developer contributions, alongside new guidance on estimating pupil yield from housing development, and a dashboard containing pupil yield factors for all local authorities. Officers have incorporated this data into their analysis.

2.3 Together these sources indicate the average number of children that might be expected to live in individual properties, depending on the number of bedrooms and tenure. However, while some key variables, for example, dwelling size and tenure mix can be factored into forecasts, there remain many intangibles to do with location and design, the state of the housing market and government policy that affect the types of people and households attracted to live in a particular development. As new developments settle and mature, so do their populations, meaning that infrastructure needs to evolve over time.

2.4 The multipliers are broken down into two categories. Where the housing mix is unknown a general multiplier is applied. Where a detailed mix is known a detailed multiplier is used.

### 2.5 General Multipliers

When discussions with a developer begin, the intended housing mix may be unknown, unfixed or known in broad terms only. In these situations, it is necessary to apply a “general multiplier” range that indicates the lowest and highest number of children that might reasonably be expected to live in the development.

2.6 The Council’s general multiplier ranges for 100 dwellings are currently:

- 20-30 pre-school aged children (0 - 3 years)
- 30-40 primary age children (4-10 years)
- 18-25 secondary age pupils (11-16 years)

For planning purposes, BIS officers advise greater use is made of the full range rather than a single mid-point figure, particularly during early discussions. At all points it is important to be clear that any child forecast is based on a set of assumptions regarding the nature of the proposed development. If these assumptions change so too will the child forecasts. Whilst a multiplier range is proposed for calculating child yield, for the purpose of calculating developer contributions where a detailed housing mix is not yet known, the top end of the range must always be used to guarantee that the Council can cover its statutory obligations regarding the provision of early years and school places.

### 2.7 Detailed Multipliers

Where a detailed housing tenure mix and dwelling size is known it is possible to forecast the number of children that might be expected to live in different types of dwellings based on the number of bedrooms and whether they are market or social rented properties. For example, 100 three-bedroom market properties would be expected to house around 20 primary-aged children compared to around 80 primary-aged children from 100 three-bedroom social rented properties. During planning for education provision on new developments there is the requirement for more detailed modelling as information on tenure and house / bedroom size becomes available. The data from the new development surveys (NDS) support this work by feeding in information on the pupil yield for different sizes and tenures of housing, enabling a standard model to be built.

## 2.8 Proposed changes to the primary-age general multiplier

The analysis of the School Census data indicates that the general multiplier of 30 – 40 children aged 4 -10 per 100 dwellings is too high in some cases. Most notable is that the pupil yield from the two Cambridge developments, Trumpington Meadows and Great Kneighton, is much lower than the current multiplier. Tables 1 and 2 show the primary multiplier broken down into Cambridge and non-Cambridge developments. They show an average of 26 for Cambridge and Cambridge Fringe developments and 36 for developments in other districts. Therefore, it is proposed that the primary multiplier for districts excluding Cambridge should remain unchanged at 30-40 and a new multiplier for Cambridge and Cambridge Fringe should be introduced at 20-30.

**Table 1: Primary School Census Data: Developments in East Cambridgeshire, Fenland, Huntingdonshire and South Cambridgeshire**

Site	Children per 100 homes 2019/20	Children per 100 homes 2020/21
Alconbury Weald	33	32
Northstowe	40	34
Godmanchester Bridge	33	36
Brampton Park	50	51
Bassenhally Farm	33	35
Ely North	29	22
<b>Average</b>	<b>36</b>	

**Table 2: Primary School Census Data: Cambridge City and fringe**

Site	Children per 100 homes 2019/20	Children per 100 homes 2020/21
Trumpington Meadows	28	26
Great Kneighton	24	25
<b>Average</b>	<b>26</b>	

**Table 3: Current and proposed general multipliers (number of children per 100 dwellings of unknown size)**

Age Group	Current	Proposed
0 to 3	20-30	20-30
4 to 10 Cambridge and fringe	30-40	20-30
4 to 10 Rest of the county	30-40	30-40
11 to 15	18-25	18-25

## 2.8 Proposed changes to the detailed multipliers

A few changes are proposed to the detailed multipliers. The current multipliers merge 1- and 2-bedroom properties into one value, using the same multiplier for each. Government Continuous Recording (CORE) of lettings of sales in social housing in England showed an average of just one child per 100 dwellings living in 1-bedroom dwellings in Cambridgeshire in 2017-2021. As very few children live in 1-bedroom properties, it is proposed that the multiplier for all 1-bedroom dwellings should be zero.

- 2.9 The current multipliers also classed shared ownership dwellings as “affordable”. The 2021 Census definitions that accompany the topic summary TS054 on housing tenure classes shared-ownership homes as owner-occupied, therefore it is proposed that shared-ownership homes should be treated with the same multiplier as market housing.
- 2.10 The NDSs for Northstowe and Alconbury showed 12.5 primary-aged children per 100 dwellings for 2-bedroom market and 60 for social-rented homes therefore the 2-bedroom multipliers have been increased to 15 for market/shared ownership and 60 for social-rented housing. The NDSs showed an average multiplier of 48 children per 100 dwellings for 4-bedroom market homes therefore the detailed multiplier has been increased to 45.
- 2.11 The general multiplier for age 11 to 15 year-olds has not been changed. However, the NDSs showed a multiplier of 13.75 per 100 2-bedroom homes, therefore the multiplier for 2-bedroom market homes has been raised to 15. The NDSs also showed 66.7 children per 100 dwellings for 3-bedroom social-rented homes, hence the detailed multiplier has been raised to 60. Because it is not logical for there to be more children generated from market 2-bedroom dwellings than social-rented homes, the detailed multiplier for 2-bedroom social rented homes has also been increased to 15 to match the market multiplier.

**Table 4: Current Detailed multipliers (number of children per 100 dwellings of given size)**

Age Group & Bedrooms per Dwelling	Market			Affordable		
	1/2	3	4+	1/2	3	4+
0 to 3	10	20	35	40	60	70
4 to 10	5	20	40	15	80	120
11 to 15	0	15	30	0	40	90

**Table 5: Proposed Detailed multipliers (number of children per 100 dwellings of given size) Developments in East Cambridgeshire, Fenland, Huntingdonshire and South Cambridgeshire**

Age Group & Bedrooms per Dwelling	Market				Affordable			
	1	2	3	4+	1	2	3	4+
0 to 3	0	10	20	35	0	40	60	70
4 to 10	0	15	20	45	0	60	80	120
11 to 15	0	5	15	30	0	15	60	90

**Table 6: Proposed Detailed multipliers (number of children per 100 dwellings of given size) Developments in Cambridge and Cambridge Fringe**

Age Group & Bedrooms per Dwelling	Market				Affordable			
	1	2	3	4+	1	2	3	4+
0 to 3	0	10	20	35	0	40	60	70
4 to 10	0	8	20	45	0	30	60	100
11 to 15	0	5	15	30	0	15	60	90

## 2.12 Outcome

These revised multipliers generate a pupil yield much closer to the actual yield than the previous ones when applied to seven development sites in the county.

2.13 The use of the proposed revised multipliers will enable the Council to anticipate ongoing implications that will need to be managed in terms of education place planning. On developments where negotiations are at an early stage, or yet to begin, for example on the Cambridge North site, the revised multipliers set out in 2.11 above will be used.

## 2.14 Special Education Needs and Disability (SEND)

The Council has a multiplier for SEND pupils that 1% of the child population aged 4-15 will attend a special school. Because of the small numbers this generates, it is applied to the largest developments only. However, because there is evidence that the proportion of children with SEND is increasing, it is recognised that there is a need to review this multiplier. There are plans to do this within the next year.

## 2.15 Post-16 Places

Officers continually monitor post-16 provision in Cambridgeshire. The last study in 2022 confirmed that there are sufficient places in the current sixth form/further education (FE) college/sixth form college system to meet anticipated future demand. The market for post-16 places works differently compared to mainstream school places with young people able to travel far greater distances to access provision. There is also a wider 'market' in operation with specialist courses and subjects on offer. Therefore, it is much harder to justify developer contributions for a specific locality. The Council only seeks places for the largest developments where a new secondary school is identified and local sixth form places will be required.

## 3. Alignment with ambitions

3.1 Net zero carbon emissions for Cambridgeshire by 2045, and our communities and natural environment are supported to adapt and thrive as the climate changes

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- Accurate forecasting ensures that the correct level of locally based infrastructure will be delivered. This reduces the need to travel by car or bus and is the basis for sustainable development.
- The Council will provide infrastructure using contributions secured through planning obligations. This will be delivered to its own Carbon reduction standards.

### 3.2 Travel across the county is safer and more environmentally sustainable

The implications are the same as set out in paragraph 3.1.

### 3.3 Health inequalities are reduced

There are no significant implications for this ambition.

### 3.4 People enjoy healthy, safe, and independent lives through timely support that is most suited to their needs

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- Accurate forecasting ensures that the correct level of locally based infrastructure will be delivered. This reduces the need to travel by car or bus and is the basis for sustainable development.

### 3.5 Helping people out of poverty and income inequality

There are no significant implications for this ambition.

### 3.6 Places and communities prosper because they have a resilient and inclusive economy, access to good quality public services and social justice is prioritised

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- There is an expectation that schools will provide access to and use of the school's accommodation for activities for example sporting, cultural, outside of school hours.
- Schools are community assets and help to support the creation and development of new communities.

### 3.7 Children and young people have opportunities to thrive

The following bullet point sets out details of implications identified by officers:

- New schools and school extension are designed and equipped for 21st century learning including providing high quality early years provision in new primary schools, should maximise educational opportunities for children.

## 4. Significant Implications

### 4.1 Resource Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- Opening a new school or extending an existing one is expensive. In addition to the capital investment, the Council is responsible for all pre-opening start-up costs in respect of new basic need schools, including diseconomy of scale costs, funding for which may be needed over several years. The pre-opening and diseconomy costs are met from the Dedicated Schools Grant, so although are a cost, they are effectively being subsidised by all other schools in Cambridgeshire rather than core funding.
- Given this burden of revenue expenditure, the Council will only consider commissioning new schools where there is no possible alternative.
- It is, therefore, essential that where new educational infrastructure is to be funded externally, that officers can evidence robustly to developers the Council's education infrastructure requirements.
- Up-to-date and credible forecasting tools, such as child yield multipliers are essential to avoid exposing the Council to the risk of a capital funding shortfall and insufficient developer contributions requiring additional Council borrowing. On the other hand, if the forecasts are too high there is the danger of providing too many places.

#### 4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- The Council delivers the capital projects where new schools are commissioned under the presumption process and these schools are designed and built under its framework arrangements.
- If the Council wishes to 'self-deliver' schools approved under the central free school programme, the DfE requires a completed business case for each project. If the business case is not approved, or the Council decides against making a case for self-delivery, the DfE takes on full responsibility for delivery of the new school under their framework. Procurement will work with the client to ensure that any procurement is carried out in a value for money and compliant manner.

#### 4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- Developers are only required to fund the level of new places required to mitigate the impact of their developments. If the Council's child yield multipliers do not reflect accurately the situation in the County, there is a risk that education capital projects will be under-resourced.

#### 4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- The Council is committed to ensuring that children with SEND can attend their local mainstream school where possible, with only those with the most complex and challenging needs requiring places at specialist provision. All new schools includes specific SEND places to allow for greater inclusion.

- As part of the planning process for new or extended educational provision, local authorities must also undertake an assessment of the impact, both on existing educational institutions locally and in terms of impact on groups of pupils, from an equality perspective.

#### 4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- All new school projects, whether initiated by the Council or via the central DfE process, are subject to a statutory process which includes public consultation requirements.
- The Council also undertakes consultation when proposing school expansion projects.

#### 4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- Officers involve the local Member(s) when proposing and undertaking projects related to provision of school places.
- The Trust or Voluntary Aided (VA) school sponsor who will run any new school are required to carry out a consultation with the community in which the school will be sited. In addition, officers encourage school sponsors appointed through the central free school programme to engage with the local Member(s).
- Local Member and CYP Spokes are also invited to be part of the assessment panel when the Council undertakes the presumption process to identify a sponsor for a new school.
- A seminar for members of the CYP Committee was run on 28 September 2023.
- The Growth and Development Team will notify relevant District Planning Managers of the change, to inform the town planning process and future S106 contributions

#### 4.7 Public Health Implications

The following bullet points set out details of the significant implications identified by officers:  
It is Council policy that schools:

- should be sited as centrally as possible to the communities they serve, unless location is dictated by physical constraints and/or the opportunity to reduce land take by providing playing fields within the green belt or green corridors.
- should be sited so that the maximum journey distance for a young person is less than the statutory walking distances (3 miles for secondary school children, 2 miles for primary school children).
- should be provided with Multi-use Games Areas (MUGAs) and all-weather pitches (AWPs) to encourage and support wider community use.
- All new building projects have to carry out their own Health Impact Assessment.
- New schools put pressure on Public Health services such as the National Child Measurement Programme (NCMP), Vision Screening, School Nursing, Healthy Schools service, School-aged Immunisation Service (SAIS) etc.

#### 4.8 Climate Change and Environment Implications on Priority Areas:

##### 4.8.1 Implication 1: Energy efficient, low carbon buildings.

###### Neutral Status:

New schools, and school expansions, will be delivered in line with the Council's own standard around energy efficient and low carbon buildings and achieve an 80% reduction in planned energy use, they will still result in increased energy demand overall, but on balance, this is a neutral status.

##### 4.8.2 Implication 2: Low carbon transport.

###### Neutral Status:

Schools on new developments are located to be accessible by walking and cycling. Where greater distances are involved, through the provision of transport services to students who are eligible through its transport assistance policy the council is able reduce environmental impacts by shifting travel out of individual vehicles and into mass transit options, which can improve carbon and air quality outcomes. Where families express a preference to attend a school outside their catchment they are encouraged, where possible, to travel by sustainable means including public transport.

##### 4.8.3 Implication 3: Green spaces, peatland, afforestation, habitats and land management.

###### Neutral status:

The planning applications for education infrastructure projects include landscape designs and will be in line with planning policy to create some green space. Any trees removed and replanted as part of site clearance will be addressed through the planning application process and will be in line with current policy and will be amended to reflect future policy changes such as Bio Diversity Net Gain.

##### 4.8.4 Implication 4: Waste Management and Tackling Plastic Pollution.

###### Neutral Status:

Waste generated by new schools will be subject to normal recycling facilities being provided on site. Other services operating from the school, e.g. early years provision by a third party, will adhere to policies on recycling

##### 4.8.5 Implication 5: Water use, availability and management:

###### Neutral Status:

The planning application for education infrastructure projects will be submitted in line with planning policy. There are statutory consultees within this which includes the Council's floods team. The design will be challenged if policy is not adhered to.

##### 4.8.6 Implication 6: Air Pollution.

###### Neutral Status:

The planning application for education infrastructure projects will be submitted in line with planning policy. Air Pollution will be addressed as part of this process.

##### 4.8.7 Implication 7: Resilience of our services and infrastructure, and supporting vulnerable people to cope with climate change.

###### Neutral Status:

Any new school proposal is designed to deliver education provision in the local community but will also facilitate community activities, for example sport and other activities by

community organisations through the school's letting policy. The services provided are not specific to climate change, however local provision makes access easier.

Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance? Yes  
Name of Financial Officer: Martin Wade

Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the Head of Procurement and Commercial? Yes  
Name of Officer: Clare Ellis

Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by the Council's Monitoring Officer or Pathfinder Legal? Yes  
Name of Legal Officer: Emma Duncan

Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your EqIA Super User? Yes  
Name of Officer: Josette Kennington

Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications? Yes  
Name of Officer: Simon Cobby

Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact? Yes  
Name of Officer: Jon Lewis

Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health? Yes  
Name of Officer: Raj Lakshman

If a Key decision, have any Climate Change and Environment implications been cleared by the Climate Change Officer?  
Yes or No  
Name of Officer:

## 5. Source documents

5.1 [Securing developer contributions for education \(DfE November 2019\)](#)

5.2 [Estimating demand for education provision arising from new housing developments \(revision of methodology\) \(CYP Committee Paper 5 December 2017\)](#)