

# Infrastructure Delivery Plan Addendum – October 2020

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 As part of the evidence base for the Gloucester City Plan (GCP), the Local Planning Authority (LPA) published the Gloucester City Infrastructure Delivery Plan Report, September 2019 (IDP Report)<sup>1</sup>. The IDP Report is a live iterative document that is intended to be updated regularly as the GCP is implemented.
- 1.2 Since the publication of the IDP Report the infrastructure ask for education from the County Council (GlosCC) has changed.
- 1.3 This addendum provides an update of GlosCC infrastructure requirements for education and sets out how those infrastructure needs impact the IDP report and GCP. An addendum has also been produced for the Viability Report<sup>2</sup>.
- 1.4 It is recommended that this addendum is read in conjunction with the IDP Report, the Joint Core Strategy Infrastructure Delivery Plan<sup>3</sup> and the Joint Core Strategy Infrastructure Gap Analysis 2016<sup>4</sup>
- 1.5 No changes to the policies or allocations of the GCP are proposed as a result of this addendum.

## 2. Findings of the IDP Report

- 2.1 The IDP Report recognises the relationship between the GCP, and the work undertaken as part of the strategic plan making process of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The GCP should not be looked at in isolation. The growth proposed in the GCP has been tested through the JCS and its evidence base.
- 2.2 A significant amount of Gloucester's need for housing and infrastructure is to be provided in cross boundary developments across the strategic area of the JCS. The IDP Report states that:

“9.2.2 The delivery of infrastructure on proposed Strategic Allocations (*sic* JCS) sites can help to respond to increased demands associated with the growth set out in the City Plan. Gloucestershire County Council Education, Community, Sports and Recreation consultees and the Clinical Commissioning Group have all cited that planned improvements and new facilities delivered through s.106 agreements relating to the nearby South Churchdown, Innsworth and North Brockworth Strategic Allocations would help to address increased infrastructure demands related to City growth.”

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.gloucester.gov.uk/media/3775/gloucester-city-idp\\_final\\_26-sept-2019-for-upload-v2.pdf](https://www.gloucester.gov.uk/media/3775/gloucester-city-idp_final_26-sept-2019-for-upload-v2.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.gloucester.gov.uk/media/3984/201909-pre-submission-gloucester-city-lp-va-final-report.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> [https://www.gloucester.gov.uk/media/1122/jcs\\_infrastructure\\_delivery\\_plan\\_full\\_document\\_august\\_2014.pdf](https://www.gloucester.gov.uk/media/1122/jcs_infrastructure_delivery_plan_full_document_august_2014.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> [https://www.gloucester.gov.uk/media/1121/jcs\\_infrastructure\\_gap\\_analysis\\_september\\_2016.pdf](https://www.gloucester.gov.uk/media/1121/jcs_infrastructure_gap_analysis_september_2016.pdf)

2.3 The IDP Report involved consultation with GlosCC, and its School Places Strategy (August 2018)<sup>5</sup> was used to establish an agreed need. The infrastructure need for education was calculated based on 1,094 potential allocated dwellings.

Table 1: Education Infrastructure Need Taken from IDP 2019

Stage of Education	Places	Cost
Early Years	Based on a demand of 23 pupils per 100 dwellings, the IDP estimates a need for 501 new early years places.	At an estimated cost of £14,541 per place this equates to an approximate cost of £6.8m.
Primary	Based on a demand of 37 primary places per 100 dwellings, the IDP estimates a need for 713 new primary school places.	At an estimated cost of £14,541 per place this equates to an approximate cost of £9.69m.
Secondary	Based on a demand of 19 secondary school places per 100 dwellings, the IDP estimates a need for 366 new secondary (including sixth form) places.	At an estimated cost of £18,779 per place this equates to an approximate cost of £6.87m.
Further Education	Based on a demand of 5.5 places per 100 dwellings, the IDP estimates a need for 106 further education places.	At an estimated cost of £18,779 per place this equates to an approximate cost of £1.99m.

### 3. Gloucester City Council Housing Update

3.1 As stated above the infrastructure need for education was calculated based on 1,094 potential allocated dwellings. This information is now out of date. The housing position as of March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2020 for Gloucester City was:

Table 2: Gloucester Housing Position March 31<sup>st</sup> 2020

<b>A</b>	<b>Housing requirement 2011 - 2031</b>	<b>14,359</b>
B	JCS strategic allocations - Tewkesbury Borough	4,895
C	JCS strategic allocations - Gloucester City	200
D	Completed as of 31 March 2020	4,460
E	Planning consents as of March 31 2020	2,611
F	Gloucester City Plan allocations	810
G	Windfall allowance	576

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/media/2083735/gloucestershire-school-places-strategy-2018-2023-draft-final.pdf>

<b>H</b>	<b>TOTAL SUPPLY</b>	<b>13,552</b>
<b>I</b>	<b>SHORTFALL</b>	<b>807</b>

#### Notes

A – Requirement set out in the Adopted JCS.

B – JCS Strategic Allocations in Tewkesbury Borough – most have outline planning permission, and reserved matters applications are now being submitted. We understand that as of the end of March 2020, Brockworth has delivered the first 21 dwellings. The figure quoted here is the allocated capacity rather than the actual number that has now been granted planning permission.

C – JCS Strategic Allocations in Gloucester City – The 200 figure represents the ‘Little Winny’ site that is currently a planning application for 217 dwellings that is with the City Council pending a decision. The larger site, known as ‘Big Winny’, has reserved matters planning permission for 420 dwellings and this is included at row E.

E – All extant planning permissions in Gloucester City as of 31 March 2020, including former City Plan allocations (now with permission) ‘Land at Barnwood Manor (net 26 dwellings) and Kings Quarter (156 dwellings).

F – All remaining Gloucester City Plan site allocations

G – This figures is the small sites windfall allowance which equates to 9 years of 64 dwellings per year. This is calculated as per a methodology agreed through the Adopted JCS.

I – There is a shortfall of development sites towards the end of the plan period – this is to be addressed as part of the JCS Review.

3.2 The LPA accepts that s.106, rather than CIL, is GlosCC’s preferred method for securing funding from developments towards education infrastructure. This approach is supported by the national changes to the CIL regulations, removing the pooling restrictions for s.106, and the IDP Report which identified that:

“9.2.4 The levels of growth proposed in the City Plan are not sufficient to require new ‘big ticket’ items of infrastructure like schools, hospitals and sports halls. Instead, money from planning obligations should be used to increase capacity at existing facilities.”

## 4. GlosCC education infrastructure needs update

4.1 GlosCC have updated their Pupil Yield Calculations and published them in a Draft Local Development Guide<sup>6</sup>. The draft guide will be put forward for adoption to GlosCC’s December 2020 Cabinet meeting. The updated pupil yields are already in use and are set at:

Table 3: Updated Pupil Yields from GlosCC

Stage of Education	Previous Pupil Yields considered in the IDP 2019 per 100 dwellings	Updated Pupil Yields per 100 dwellings (increase)
Early Years (pre-school)	23	30 (+7)

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/media/2097736/ldg-2020-refresh-final-consultation-draft-28-04-2020.pdf>

Primary	37	41 (+4)
Secondary	19	20 (+1)
Further Education (post 16)	5.5	7 (+1.5)*

\*The County has recently relayed that research on Post 16 school places had in error been based upon three year groups rather than two year groups, such that 11 per 100 qualifying dwelling should instead be 7 per 100 qualifying dwellings.

- 4.2 The costs per place have also increased and are already being used in response to planning application consultations:

Table 4: Updated Costs per Place

Stage of Education	Previous cost per place	Updated cost per place (increase)
Early Years (pre-school)	£14,541	£15,091 (+£550)
Primary	£14,541	£15,091 (+£550)
Secondary	£18,779	£19,490 (+£711)
Further Education (post 16)	£18,779	£23,012 (+£4213)

- 4.3 GlosCC were asked to outline the education need based on the increased pupil yields and costs per place taking account of the revised housing figures presented in Table 2 of this addendum.
- 4.4 A draft Education Needs Assessment for the GCP was provided by the GlosCC in October 2020 and can be found in Appendix 1. This assessment shows a total requirement of £12.63 million for 780 dwellings.
- 4.5 This is a reduction of £12.72m from the previous IDP as illustrated below:

Table 5: Comparison of Education Need

Stage of Education	IDP 2019	Draft Education Needs Assessment October 2020 (+/- change to 2019)
Early Years (pre-school)	£6.8m	£3.53m (-3.27m)
Primary	£9.69m	£4.8m (-£4.89m)
Secondary	£6.87m	£3.04m (-3.83m)
Further Education (post 16)	£1.99m	£1.26m (-0.73m)
<b>Total</b>	<b>£25.35m</b>	<b>£12.63m (-12.72m)</b>

- 4.6 In terms of windfall developments, it is estimated that these will average 64 dwellings each year over the next nine years. Using GlosCC's figures GCC calculated the estimated ask from the windfall to be:

Table 6: Windfall Estimates

Stage of Education	Pupil Yield at 64 dwellings per year	Annual cost of places at 64 dwellings per year
Early Years (pre-school)	19.2	£289,747
Primary	26.24	£395,987
Secondary	12.8	£249,472
Further Education (post 16)	7	£161,084
<b>Total</b>		<b>£1,096,290</b>

- 4.7 Over 9 years this would equate to an additional £9,866,610. Combined with the £12.63m requested through the Education Needs Assessment equals an ask of £22,496,610 for education infrastructure. Divided this by the number of homes tested (780) and the windfall allowance for 9 years (576) and this equates to an average of £16,590 per dwelling.
- 4.8 The average cost per dwelling for education now stands at £16,590. This is a reduction of £6,581 per dwelling from £23,171 per dwelling average ask in the 2019 IDP Report.
- 4.9 This decrease is a result of reduced housing allocations, due to planning applications already determined on proposed site allocations, and a more thorough analysis by GlosCC of the education planning area each proposed allocation falls into.
- 4.10 These are maximum requirements and may be reduced if there is school capacity at the time when planning applications are submitted for these sites. As it stands local capacity has not fed into the calculations by GlosCC as the numbers of children on a school register and therefore school capacities are subject to change.
- 4.11 A more thorough analysis at the planning application stage is required to ensure that the ask is reflective of the regulatory requirements of planning obligations to be: (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; (b) directly related to the development; and (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

## 5. Funding

- 5.1 Despite the overall ask for education contributions reducing, as previously identified in the JCS and GCP IDP reports, there will be a funding gap between infrastructure requirements and estimated receipts from planning obligations.
- 5.2 The viability addendum for the GCP suggest with affordable housing at 25% and the affordable housing mix reflecting the Local Housing Needs Assessment 2020 that £5000 per dwelling for s106 would be possible. Beyond this figure, sites within the low value areas and some of the flatted schemes within the high value areas would be at the margin of viability or become unviable. This potentially would impact on the soundness of the City Plan to deliver its policy requirements in full.

- 5.3 This £5000 per dwelling is significantly lower than the £16,590 per dwelling average requested by GlosCC for education infrastructure. As such other funding mechanisms will need to be drawn upon and priorities established and regularly reviewed.
- 5.4 It is important to recognise that the figures presented by GlosCC to inform this addendum are maximum figures that may reduce if additional school capacity is available to meet the needs of the development at the point the planning application is made. As such the true costs are uncertain.
- 5.5 The Department of Education (DfE) are in the process of producing national guidance on the methodology used for calculating pupil yields which may or may not have a bearing on the methodology used by GlosCC.
- 5.6 It is understood that the development industry is in the process of actively challenging the approach taken by GlosCC for s.106 requests. This may or may not have an implication on future requests for s.106 contributions.
- 5.7 The figures may also be reduced once the nature of the development is fully known. Education contributions are not sought for 1-bedroom dwellings. All dwellings were included in the maximum calculation with no discount for 1-bedroom dwellings.
- 5.8 The funding mechanisms explored in chapter 5 of the IDP Report remain valid. These include the Dedicated Schools Grant (£451.1m for Gloucestershire in 2019-2020), national funding programmes and grants through the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, the DfE and the Education Skills Funding Agency. All of which will continue to provide a key role in delivering new school places associated with GCP growth.
- 5.9 The City Council will support GlosCC and others with any bids for future funding pots by providing trajectory information and other such data to demonstrate growth.
- 5.10 Additional funding may become available from further waves of the central funding programme for Free Schools and University Technical Colleges. The outcome of wave 14 applications is not yet known and could be of benefit to Gloucester. Three applications for new schools are being considered by the Government for funding. If approved these new schools would help to meet Gloucester's need greatly reducing the shortfall.
- 5.11 Government Development Contributions Guidance<sup>7</sup> promotes the use of the planning process (via CIL/s.106) to secure funding. It does however not do this in isolation of viability matters:
- “While basic need funding can be used for new school places that are required due to housing development, we would expect this to be the minimum amount necessary to maintain development viability, having taken into account all infrastructure requirements.” Para 6
- 5.12 This indicates that in order to maintain development viability GlosCC are eligible to apply for Basic Need Funding<sup>8</sup> from the DfE to assist them to meet their duty to provide primary and

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/delivering-schools-to-support-housing-growth>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/basic-need-allocations>

secondary school places for children in the area, should they fail to secure adequate developer contributions.

5.13 Several former education sites within the city (former Bishops College school being a notable example) have been disposed of by GlosCC for housing development despite the demonstrable need for education infrastructure presented to the JCS and GCP processes by GlosCC. It is understood that the monies from these developments have not been ringfenced for replacement education infrastructure. This has resulted in a significant reduction in potential school places and created an additional burden on the local districts to provide new infrastructure. This is an unsustainable approach.

## 6. Going Forward

- 6.1 Throughout the iterative process of the JCS and GCP IDP work prioritisation has been necessary to ensure that critical infrastructure is funded first to enable the required growth to take place. This is outlined in the JCS Infrastructure Delivery Plans Infrastructure Funding Gap Analysis (2016).
- 6.2 This prioritisation work is ongoing and will be built upon through the production of the required Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS). This will set out details of s.106 and CIL revenues, how monies have been spent and details of future projects and priorities. The IFS will be updated annually and provides an opportunity to prioritise CIL expenditure.
- 6.3 GlosCC are also required to produce an IFS. This will be a very important document that will help the LPA understand GlosCC infrastructure priorities. At the moment there are no clear priorities presented by GlosCC for situations where viability undermines plan deliverability and full s.106 contributions are not possible. GlosCC are responsible for a number of areas that take s.106 funding including education, highways, libraries etc. Understanding GlosCC priorities in this regard will allow for more fluidity and responsiveness to address targeted infrastructure needs that are essential for enabling the growth outlined in the JCS.
- 6.4 It is essential that the IDP 2019 continues to be used in an iterative manner and updated to reflect key national and local changes including plan reviews. This is a very uncertain time and the full implications of Covid-19 on school capacity and the future of the education system and the infrastructure required to support that are not fully known.
- 6.5 A number of unknowns persist with regard to the GlosCC pupil yields and assumed costs per pupil. While the GCC has no desire to challenge these assumptions, they are being challenged by the development industry and the emerging national guidance on such matters may provide further clarity.
- 6.6 Unknowns also exist in terms of the actual cost of education rather than the maximum costs. This will have to be assessed on a site by site basis at the time of processing a planning application to ensure that any local capacity at existing schools in the vicinity is discounted.

- 6.7 Housing mix also has the potential to reduce costs should the developments contain any 1-bedroom dwellings. Cost will also be reduced if new schools are secured through current and future applications for grant.
- 6.8 In accordance with the NPPF the LPA can use planning obligation review mechanisms to assess viability over the lifetime of a project in order to secure further contributions should viability improve. Policy G8: Review Mechanism has been included within the GCP to ensure this approach.
- 6.9 As the recent planning White Paper evolves and progresses the LPA may find itself working within a new system of infrastructure funding within the plan period.
- 6.10 While there is an acknowledged gap in the infrastructure funding of the GCP there are a number of funding options identified in the IDP and this addendum. There is also the flexibility of the IFS process to ensure suitable prioritisation of infrastructure projects.
- 6.11 The LPA will continue to work positively with GlosCC in accordance with its Duty to Cooperate, the emerging Gloucestershire Statement of Common Ground, the emerging Statement of Common Ground between both parties, and any bidding for alternative funding opportunities for education that GlosCC wishes to pursue.



# Appendix 1

Note: this assessment indicates the closest schools and planning areas to each allocation site.  
 The contributions may not be spent in exactly these planning areas because it may be more efficient to plan for larger expansions at fewer schools.

Ref	Nearest Postcode	Site	Residential capacity	Early Years Yield	Maximum Contribution	Primary Yield	Maximum Contribution	Closest Primary School (Edubase/travel distance)	916 Primary Planning Area	Secondary Yield (11-18)	Maximum Contribution	Closest and/or Catchment Secondary School (Edubase/travel distance)	916 Secondary Planning Area
SA01	GL4 4FG	Land at the Wheatridge	10	3.0	£45,273.00	4.1	£61,873.10	Heron (0.24/0.4)	1932 Abbey Matson Upton	2.7	£55,088.40	Barnwood Park (1.2/1.6)	2600 Gloucester
SA03	GL1 1SW	Former Prospect House, 67 – 69 London Road	30	9.0	£135,819.00	12.3	£185,619.30	Kingsholm (0.34)	1910 Longlevens	8.1	£165,265.20	Barnwood Park (1.28/1.9)	2600 Gloucester
SA04	GL1 3NF	Former Wessex House, Great Western Road	20	6.0	£90,546.00	8.2	£123,746.20	Widden (0.23/0.5) Kingsholm (0.41/0.5)	1920 Barton Tredworth 1910 Longlevens	5.4	£110,176.80	Barnwood Park (1.23/1.8)	2600 Gloucester
SA05	GL1 3PP	Land at Great Western Road Sidings	200	60.0	£905,460.00	82	£1,237,462.00	Widden (0.22/0.4)	1920 Barton Tredworth	54	£1,101,768.00	Barnwood Park (1.2/1.4)	2600 Gloucester
SA09	GL1 2HY	Former Quayside House, Blackfriars	50	15.0	£226,365.00	20.5	£309,365.50	St Pauls (0.74/0.8)	1950 Linden	13.5	£275,442.00	Barnwood Park (1.92/2.4)	2600 Gloucester
SA10	GL1 2HH	Former Fleece Hotel / Longsmith Street car park	25	7.5	£113,182.50	10.25	£154,682.75	Kingsholm (0.52/0.7) St Pauls (0.56/0.7)	1910 Longlevens 1950 Linden	6.75	£137,721.00	Barnwood Park (1.74/2.2)	2600 Gloucester
SA11	GL1 2SG	Land rear of St Oswalds Retail Park	300	90.0	£1,358,190.00	123	£1,856,193.00	Kingsholm (0.34/0.7)	1910 Longlevens	81	£1,652,652.00	Barnwood Park (1.93/2.6)	2600 Gloucester
SA13	GL1 4AD	Former Colwell Youth and Community Centre	20	6.0	£90,546.00	8.2	£123,746.20	Widden (0.17/0.3)	1920 Barton Tredworth	5.4	£110,176.80	Barnwood Park (0.98/1.3)	2600 Gloucester
SA14	GL1 5PJ	Land off New Dawn View	30	9.0	£135,819.00	12.3	£185,619.30	Calton (0.33/0.4)	1950 Linden	8.1	£165,265.20	Holmleigh Park (1.21/1.5)	2600 Gloucester
SA15	GL4 6EG	Land south of Winnycroft allocation	30	9.0	£135,819.00	12.3	£185,619.30	Robinswood (0.68/0.8) Moat (0.82/0.9)	1932 Abbey Matson Upton	8.1	£165,265.20	Barnwood Park (2.04/2.3)	2600 Gloucester
SA16	GL1 1QT	Land off Lower Eastgate Street	15	4.5	£67,909.50	6.15	£92,809.65	Widden (0.38)	1920 Barton Tredworth	4.05	£82,632.60	Barnwood Park (1.5/1.7)	2600 Gloucester
SA18	GL4 3TL	Jordan's Brook House	20	6.0	£90,546.00	8.2	£123,746.20	Dinglwell inf & jun (0.33/0.4)	1930 Hucclecote	5.4	£110,176.80	Barnwood Park (0.49/0.5)	2600 Gloucester
SA19	GL1 3PX	Land off Myers Road	10	3.0	£45,273.00	4.1	£61,873.10	Widden (0.55/0.4)	1920 Barton Tredworth	2.7	£55,088.40	Barnwood Park (1.08/1.4)	2600 Gloucester
SA21	GL1 2LG	Part of West Quay, The Docks	20	6.0	£90,546.00	8.2	£123,746.20	St Pauls (0.330.5)	1950 Linden	5.4	£110,176.80	Barnwood Park (1.08/2.5)	2600 Gloucester
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>780</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>£3,531,294.00</b>	<b>319.8</b>	<b>£4,826,101.80</b>			<b>210.6</b>	<b>£4,296,895.20</b>		

Primary Planning Area	Residential capacity	Primary Yield	Maximum Contribution
1910 Longlevens	352.5	144.5	£2,181,026.78
1920 Barton Tredworth	255	104.6	£1,577,764.05
1930 Hucclecote	20	8.2	£123,746.20
1932 Abbey Matson Upton	40	16.4	£247,492.40
1950 Linden	112.5	46.1	£696,072.38
<b>Total Primary</b>	<b>780</b>	<b>319.8</b>	<b>£4,826,101.80</b>

Calculator	Nov 19 PPR	Multipliers 2019 (DfE per place)
Early Years	0.30	£15,091.00
Primary	0.41	£15,091.00
Secondary	0.20	£19,490.00
Post 16	0.07	£23,012.00

Catchment Secondary School	Residential capacity	Secondary Yield (11-18)	Maximum Contribution
Barnwood Park	750	202.5	£4,131,630.00
Holmleigh Park	30	8.1	£165,265.20
<b>Total Secondary</b>	<b>780</b>	<b>210.6</b>	<b>£4,296,895.20</b>

Note: this assessment indicates the closest schools and planning areas to each allocation site.

The contributions may not be spent in exactly these planning areas because it may be more efficient to plan for larger expansions at fewer schools.

Ref	Nearest Postcode	Site	Residential capacity	Secondary Yield (11-18)	Maximum Contribution	Closest and/or Catchment Secondary School (Edubase/travel distance)	916 Secondary Planning Area	Secondary Yield (11-16)	Maximum Contribution	Secondary Yield (16-18)	Maximum Contribution
SA01	GL4 4FG	Land at the Wheatridge	10	2.7	£55,088.40	Barnwood Park (1.2/1.6)	2600 Gloucester	2.0	£38,980.00	0.7	£16,108.40
SA03	GL1 1SW	Former Prospect House, 67 – 69 London Road	30	8.1	£165,265.20	Barnwood Park (1.28/1.9)	2600 Gloucester	6.0	£116,940.00	2.1	£48,325.20
SA04	GL1 3NF	Former Wessex House, Great Western Road	20	5.4	£110,176.80	Barnwood Park (1.23/1.8)	2600 Gloucester	4.0	£77,960.00	1.4	£32,216.80
SA05	GL1 3PP	Land at Great Western Road Sidings	200	54	£1,101,768.00	Barnwood Park (1.2/1.4)	2600 Gloucester	40.0	£779,600.00	14	£322,168.00
SA09	GL1 2HY	Former Quayside House, Blackfriars	50	13.5	£275,442.00	Barnwood Park (1.92/2.4)	2600 Gloucester	10.0	£194,900.00	3.5	£80,542.00
SA10	GL1 2HH	Former Fleece Hotel / Longsmith Street car park	25	6.75	£137,721.00	Barnwood Park (1.74/2.2)	2600 Gloucester	5.0	£97,450.00	1.75	£40,271.00
SA11	GL1 2SG	Land rear of St Oswalds Retail Park	300	81	£1,652,652.00	Barnwood Park (1.93/2.6)	2600 Gloucester	60.0	£1,169,400.00	21	£483,252.00
SA13	GL1 4AD	Former Colwell Youth and Community Centre	20	5.4	£110,176.80	Barnwood Park (0.98/1.3)	2600 Gloucester	4.0	£77,960.00	1.4	£32,216.80
SA14	GL1 5PJ	Land off New Dawn View	30	8.1	£165,265.20	Holmleigh Park (1.21/1.5)	2600 Gloucester	6.0	£116,940.00	2.1	£48,325.20
SA15	GL4 6EG	Land south of Winnycroft allocation	30	8.1	£165,265.20	Barnwood Park (2.04/2.3)	2600 Gloucester	6.0	£116,940.00	2.1	£48,325.20
SA16	GL1 1QT	Land off Lower Eastgate Street	15	4.05	£82,632.60	Barnwood Park (1.5/1.7)	2600 Gloucester	3.0	£58,470.00	1.05	£24,162.60
SA18	GL4 3TL	Jordan's Brook House	20	5.4	£110,176.80	Barnwood Park (0.49/0.5)	2600 Gloucester	4.0	£77,960.00	1.4	£32,216.80
SA19	GL1 3PX	Land off Myers Road	10	2.7	£55,088.40	Barnwood Park (1.08/1.4)	2600 Gloucester	2.0	£38,980.00	0.7	£16,108.40
SA21	GL1 2LG	Part of West Quay, The Docks	20	5.4	£110,176.80	Barnwood Park (1.08/2.5)	2600 Gloucester	4.0	£77,960.00	1.4	£32,216.80
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>780</b>	<b>210.6</b>	<b>£4,296,895.20</b>			<b>156.0</b>	<b>£3,040,440.00</b>	<b>54.6</b>	<b>£1,256,455.20</b>

Catchment Secondary School	Residential capacity	Secondary Yield (11-18)	Maximum Contribution	Secondary Yield (11-16)	Maximum Contribution	Secondary Yield (16-18)	Maximum Contribution
Barnwood Park	750	202.5	£4,131,630.00	150.0	£2,923,500.00	52.5	£1,208,130.00
Holmleigh Park	30	8.1	£165,265.20	6.0	£116,940.00	2.1	£48,325.20
<b>Total Secondary</b>	<b>780</b>	<b>210.6</b>	<b>£4,296,895.20</b>	<b>156.0</b>	<b>£3,040,440.00</b>	<b>54.6</b>	<b>£1,256,455.20</b>

Calculator	Nov 19 PPR	Multipliers 2019 (DfE per place)
Secondary	0.20	£19,490.00
Post 16	0.07	£23,012.00