#### PERTH AND KINROSS COUNCIL

# Lifelong Learning Committee 29 October 2014

# PROPOSAL TO REPLACE BOTH KINROSS PRIMARY SCHOOL AND TULLOCH PRIMARY SCHOOL

# Report by Executive Director (Education and Children's Services)

# **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

Following the announcement of additional funding from the Scottish Government, the Executive Sub-Committee of the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee (SP&R) will consider the acceptance, in principle, of this funding on 27 October 2014. Subject to approval by the Sub-Committee this report recommends that the Lifelong Learning Committee approve the replacement of both Kinross Primary School and Tulloch Primary School, subject to Strategic Policy and Resources Committee approval of the detailed costings and reporting on progress to the School Estate Sub-Committee.

#### 1. BACKGROUND/MAIN ISSUES

- 1.1 In the mid 1960's several schools were constructed using a pre-fabricated type of construction, Consortium of Local Authorities Special Programme (CLASP) variants. Although speed of erection and cost were attractive to Councils in the 1960's, these buildings have deteriorated with age and have now reached a point where they are no longer viable to maintain and are unsustainable in terms of energy conservation.
- 1.2 There remains three primary schools in Perth and Kinross built to CLASP Mark 4 standard; Oakbank Primary School, Kinross Primary School and Tulloch Primary School.
- 1.3 The replacement of Oakbank Primary School was funded as part of the setting of the Capital Programme for 2012/13 to 2016/17. The new school will open in August 2015.
- 1.4 On 30 August 2012, the School Estate Sub-Committee (Report No. 12/371 refers) noted the Council submitted a bid for up to £8.5m to the Scottish Government to refurbish or replace Tulloch Primary School under Phase 3 of the Scotland's Schools for the Future Programme. This bid was not successful.
- 1.5 On 14 February 2013, the Special Council Meeting agreed £8.5m as part of the setting of the capital budget 2017/18 to 2019/20 (Report No. <u>13/54</u> refers) to improve a further CLASP school, in addition to Oakbank Primary School.
- 1.6 On 6 June 2013, the School Estate Sub-Committee (Report No. <u>13/282</u> refers) endorsed the approach that bids for the CLASP (variant) programme would be

- submitted as part of future budget setting process, and that any other funding streams would also be considered if available.
- 1.7 In March 2014, the Council commissioned a Strategic Options Appraisal through the East Central Hub (HubCo) to determine the most appropriate capital investment strategy for both Kinross and Tulloch Primary Schools.
- 1.8 Additional investment of £100m for the Scotland's Schools for the Future (SSF) Programme was announced in June 2014 by the Scottish Government. The aim of the additional investment was to continue to remove schools out of poor (category C) or bad (category D) condition to satisfactory (category B) or good (category A) as soon as possible, either through refurbishment or replacement. The funding also requires there to be a capital allocation from the Council towards projects. Kinross Primary School and Tulloch Primary School meet the Scottish Government criteria outlined above.
- 1.9 On the basis of these previous reports, the draft options appraisal and the announcement detailed in paragraph 1.8, the Council approached the Scottish Futures Trust in July 2014 and outlined the strong case for replacing both Kinross and Tulloch Primary Schools.

#### 2. PROPOSALS

- 2.1 This report informs Committee of the findings and recommendations of an options appraisal which considers options for investing in Kinross and Tulloch Primary Schools. The options considered in the appraisal are:
  - (a) Do minimum
  - (b) Full refurbishment
  - (c) New build replacement
- 2.2 The options appraisal recommends option (c) as the best option in terms of value for money for both schools.
- 2.3 The report also recommends that both schools are replaced as soon as funding is available, due to the limited lifespan of the building type and the potential requirement for substantial remedial works, if replacement is not forthcoming in the short-term.
- 2.4 The options appraisal confirmed that it is possible to replace both schools on the existing school sites.
- 2.5 The site area at Kinross will allow the new build school to be constructed adjacent to the 'live' school, as per the current Oakbank Primary School Project. The existing school would then be demolished with pitches and parking being reinstated.
- 2.6 The site area available to construct a new build school adjacent to the 'live' school at Tulloch is insufficient to progress a tandem build, as at Kinross. The development of the site will require a decant facility which will allow the

- existing building to be demolished and afford the contractor the full site area to construct the new building.
- 2.7 It is anticipated that the design and construction period will be approximately 118 weeks, with demolition and ground works continuing beyond this date.

#### 3. FUNDING

- 3.1 The Scottish Government announced additional funding for Scotland' Schools for the Future Programme on 10 October 2014. The Council has been successful in being offered two thirds funding towards the replacement of both Kinross Primary School and Tulloch Primary School on a like for like basis.
- 3.2 The funding model replicates that of previous Scottish Futures Trust funding, which is a revenue based model, delivered through the East Central Hub (HubCo).
- 3.3 The funding proposal will be considered by the Executive Sub-Committee of Strategic Policy and Resources on 27 October 2014 (Report No. 14/447 refers).
- 3.4 The Outline Business Cases for both schools have been updated to reflect the outcome of the options appraisal and the offer of funding. They are attached as Appendix A and Appendix B.

# 4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 The options appraisal for both Kinross Primary School and Tulloch Primary School recommends replacement as soon as funding is available.
- 4.2 Additional funding has been made available from the Scottish Government under the Schools for the Future Programme.
- 4.3 The funding proposal will be considered by the Executive Sub-Committee of the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee on 27 October 2014 (Report 14/447 refers). Subject to approval in principle of the offer a report on detailed costings will be submitted to the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee. Progress reports will also be submitted to the School Estate Sub-Committee.
- 4.4 It is anticipated that the schools will be completed by during 2017, however this will have to be confirmed when the projects are underway and further reports will be submitted to School Estate Sub-Committee on progress.
- 4.5 It is recommended that the Lifelong Learning Committee:
  - (i) Approves the replacement of both Kinross Primary School and Tulloch Primary School, subject to approval by the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee of the detailed costings.

- (ii) Instructs the Executive Director (Education and Children's Service to submit further reports on progress of the project to the School Estate Sub-Committee.
- (iii) Approves that the design and development of both schools is taken forward with the Scottish Futures Trust and East Central Hub.

Author(s)

Name	Designation	Contact Details
Carol Taylor	Service Manager (Resource Management), Education and Children's Services	475595 CATaylor@pkc.gov.uk

**Approved** 

Name	Designation	Date
John Fyffe	<b>Executive Director</b>	14 October 2014

If you or someone you know would like a copy of this document in another language or format, (on occasion, only a summary of the document will be provided in translation), this can be arranged by contacting the Customer Service Centre on 01738 475000.

You can also send us a text message on 07824 498145.

All Council Services can offer a telephone translation facility.

# 1. IMPLICATIONS, ASSESSMENTS, CONSULTATION AND COMMUNICATION

Strategic Implications	Yes / None
Community Plan / Single Outcome Agreement	Yes
Corporate Plan	Yes
Resource Implications	
Financial	Yes
Workforce	None
Asset Management (land, property, IST)	Yes
Assessments	
Equality Impact Assessment	Yes
Strategic Environmental Assessment	Yes
Sustainability (community, economic, environmental)	Yes
Legal and Governance	Yes
Risk	Yes
Consultation	
Internal	Yes
External	Yes
Communication	
Communications Plan	No

# 1. Strategic Implications

# Community Plan/Single Outcome Agreement

- 1.1 The proposals relate to the delivery of the Perth and Kinross Community Plan/Single Outcome Agreement in terms of the following priorities:
  - (i) Giving every child the best start in life;
  - (ii) Developing educated, responsible and informed citizens;
  - (iii) Promoting a prosperous, inclusive and sustainable economy;
  - (iv) Supporting people to lead independent, healthy and active lives; and
  - (v) Creating a safe and sustainable place for future generations.

This report relates to all of these objectives.

#### Corporate Plan

- 1.2 The Perth and Kinross Community Plan 2013 2023 and Perth and Kinross Council Corporate Plan 2013/2018 set out five strategic objectives:
  - (i) Giving every child the best start in life;
  - (ii) Developing educated, responsible and informed citizens;
  - (iii) Promoting a prosperous, inclusive and sustainable economy;
  - (iv) Supporting people to lead independent, healthy and active lives; and
  - (v) Creating a safe and sustainable place for future generations.

This report relates to all of these objectives.

- 1.3 The report also links to the Education & Children's Services Policy Framework in respect of the following key policy area:
  - Maximising Resources

# 2. Resource Implications

#### Financial

2.1 The Council has been successful in bidding for funding from Scottish Schools for the Future Programme and this has been approved by the Executive Sub Committee of Strategic Policy and Resources Committee on 27 October 2014. It should be noted that the cost does not include an allowance for inflation and is for a like-for-like replacement. It does not therefore include developments to support the Early Years Strategy or additional accommodation to meet increased capacity. Consideration will also need to be given to accommodation for Additional Support Needs (ASN) services.

#### Workforce

2.2 There are no direct workforce implications arising from this report.

# Asset Management (land, property, IT)

2.3 There are no direct asset management implications arising from this report other than those reported within the body of the main report.

### 3. Assessments

#### **Equality Impact Assessment**

- 3.1 Under the Equality Act 2010, the Council is required to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between equality groups. Carrying out Equality Impact Assessments for plans and policies allows the Council to demonstrate that it is meeting these duties.
- 3.1.1 The information contained within this report has been considered under the Corporate Equalities Impact Assessment process (EqIA) and has been assessed as not relevant for the purposes of EqIA.

### Strategic Environmental Assessment

- 3.2 The Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005 places a duty on the Council to identify and assess the environmental consequences of its proposals.
- 3.2.1 However, no action is required as the Act does not apply to the matters presented in this report. This is because these matters relate to the School

Estate Strategy which is being considered under the Act as part of The Council's Asset Management Plan.

#### Sustainability

- 3.3 Under the provisions of the Local Government in Scotland Act 2003 the Council has to discharge its duties in a way which contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. In terms of the Climate Change Act, the Council has a general duty to demonstrate its commitment to sustainability and the community, environmental and economic impacts of its actions.
- 3.3.1 The information contained within this report has been considered under the Act. However, no action is required as the Act does not apply to the matters presented in this report.

#### Legal and Governance

3.4 The Head of Legal Services has been consulted in the preparation of this report.

# Risk

3.5 Risk has been considered in the options appraisal to which this report refers. Individual risk profiles will be put in place for each of projects detailed in the report.

#### 4. Consultation

#### Internal

4.1 The Head of Democratic Services, Head of Finance and Head of Property Services have been consulted in the preparation of this report.

### **External**

- 4.2 Participation and involvement of the community are critical to the ongoing and future success of school estate investment and an emphasis is placed on ensuring consultation, over and above that which might be required in terms of planning requirements.
- 4.2.1 A User Reference Group (URG) is set up for all major and large projects. The purpose of the URG is to assist with providing relevant local input to allow the Design Team to develop the outline concept design into an operational design. The formation of a URG is an invaluable source of information, and any project is reliant on this level of local detail.

# 5. Communication

Individual communication plans will be put in place for each of the projects detailed in the report.

# 2. BACKGROUND PAPERS

No background papers, as defined by Section 50D of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 (other than any containing confidential or exempt information) were relied on to any material extent in preparing the above report.

#### 3. APPENDICES

Appendix A: Outline Business Case – Kinross Primary School

Appendix B: Outline Business Case – Tulloch Primary School



# **Outline Business Case**

Title:	Kinross F School	Primary	Executive Sponsor:	John Fyffe
Business Plan	Ref:	Version 1	Senior Responsible Owner	Sheena Devlin
Author:	Carol Tay	lor	Date:	20 October 2014

#### 1. Executive Summary

In setting the capital budget for 2017/18 - 2019/20, £8.5m was approved towards replacing schools of the same construction as Oakbank Primary School. There are two primary schools of the same construction type; these are Kinross Primary School and Tulloch Primary School.

In March 2014, the Council commissioned a Strategic Options Appraisal to determine the most appropriate capital investment strategy for both Kinross and Tulloch Primary Schools.

The options appraisal concluded that both Kinross and Tulloch Primary Schools should be replaced as soon as funding became available.

On 10 October 2014, the Scottish Government announced two thirds funding contribution towards both Kinross and Tulloch Primary Schools.

#### 2. Introduction

The Education (Scotland) Act 1980 states that Councils have a statutory duty to make adequate and efficient provision of school education across their entire area for the current school population and future pattern of demand. In addition, they have a responsibility to achieve Best Value as outlined in the Local Government in Scotland Act 2003.

In order to ensure good asset management practice, work has been done to establish Performance Indicators, on which the prioritisation of the Capital Investment Programme for primary schools can be based. A model has been developed based on the current core facts, condition, suitability and potential occupancy based on the effect of new house building on school roll projections. Each of these criteria has then been weighted to give an overall prioritised score for each school with a clear indication of where capital resources require to be targeted.

On 30 August 2012, the School Estate Sub Committee approved the draft School Estate Strategy (Report No. 12/370 refers).

This strategic approach embraces the Service's vision of a confident and ambitious Perth and Kinross with a strong identity and clear outcomes that everyone works together to achieve. Our area will be vibrant and successful; a safe, secure and healthy environment; and a place where people and communities are nurtured and supported. Our key service priorities support the delivery of our commitments in the Single Outcome Agreement and Corporate Plan, helping Education & Children's Services (ECS) to focus on the local outcomes that will achieve meaningful improvements for our stakeholders. In summary this project specifically links to the Single Outcome Agreement Local Outcomes 5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13 and 15. These link to Education and Children's Services priorities:

#### They are:

- Raising achievement for all;
- Supporting vulnerable children and families;

- Improving the quality of life for individuals and communities; and
- Enabling the delivery of high qualify public services.

In addition to the ECS policy framework areas, it is important to recognise emerging priorities within the Council and plan for these. The four strategic themes listed below are the current EOT sponsorship of the political priorities. This project will be taken forward in line with these priorities:

- Getting it Right for Every Child (GIRFEC)
- Health and Social Care Integration
- Public Protection
- Regeneration (Social, Physical, Economic)

#### 2.1. Current Position

In March 2014, the Council commissioned a Strategic Options Appraisal to determine the most appropriate capital investment strategy for both Kinross and Tulloch Primary Schools.

The options appraisal concluded that both Kinross and Tulloch Primary Schools should be replaced as soon as funding became available.

Kinross can be replaced on the existing site, with the old school being demolished after the new school is operational. The options appraisal was based on 18 classrooms. This would incorporate potential additional capacity through house building. Consideration will have to be given to increasing Early Years provision to accommodate new legislative requirements related to 600 hours and 2 year olds. Additional Support Needs (ASN) provision may also be required.

On 10 October 2014, the Scottish Government announced two thirds funding contribution towards both Kinross and Tulloch Primary Schools.

#### 3. Benefits

Education & Children's Services has a statutory duty to provide education services at a local level which requires response to an ever-changing landscape. We must ensure that the school buildings are appropriate to respond to both national and local curricular variations. We must ensure that we provide excellent schools that make a positive contribution to local communities. This project allows Education & Children's Services to meet the above challenges and uses resources available in a way that provides best value yet also provides the optimum benefits, including:

- Provide accommodation to allow the delivery of the functions of Education and Children's Services in a way which meets the needs of children and families both now and in the future:
- Provide accommodation that ensures the curriculum offered will meet the needs of all learners;
- Provide enhanced Early Learning and Child Care services;
- Reduce overall running costs and ongoing maintenance burdens;

- Safeguard the interests of the Council;
- Provide accommodation that is compliant with current legislative standards;
- Provide a safe, secure and welcoming environment to suit the needs of all users of the establishments;
- Meet the needs of the current and future known roll projections;
- Provide accommodation that supports inclusion and equality;
- Provide opportunities for the use of new technology; and
- Provide accommodation that focuses on the needs and aspirations of young people.

# 4. Objectives

The key objectives of Education and Children's services which this project is intended to support are:

- Ensure learners in Perth and Kinross will have the opportunity to access learning throughout life in a positive, coherent and supportive framework;
- Promote the change and improvement of the service we provide;
- Meet the needs of key stakeholders ensuring shared and agreed priorities through integrated working;
- Provide a Service that demonstrates inclusion, equality and joint working throughout;
- Ensure sustainable development.

#### 5. Critical Success Factors

Education & Children's Services buildings must remain flexible and adaptable to respond to the range of initiatives and developments that are likely to emerge in the future, both for the school community and the wider community. They must deliver an estate that has consistent standards in terms of building design and facilities and be in line with the outcomes of the Single Outcome Agreement.

The key success factors of this project will be:

- Ensure compliance with current legislative standards i.e. Education (Scotland)
   Act:
- Equality Act 2010 and Building Bulletin guidance etc;
- · Sufficient capital funding to meet the demands;
- Sufficient staff resources to support the project;
- Sufficient timescale to deliver the project;
- Receipt of appropriate statutory consents;
- Reduce energy costs and carbon emission reductions.

#### 6. Key Activities

The key milestones for the project are as follows:

Activity	Milestone
Bid to CRG for funding as part of the 2017/18 to 19/20	October 2012
capital budget process	
Bid to Scottish Government for Scotland's Schools for	July 2014
the Future funding	
Options appraisal to determine the best solution for this	September 2014
building	
Strategic Policy and Resources approval of funding	October 2014
Lifelong Learning Committee approval of projects	October 2014
New Project Request submitted to HubCo	To be confirmed
Stage 1 approval	To be confirmed
Stage 2 approval	To be confirmed
Construction Start	To be confirmed
Construction Complete	To be confirmed
School Operational	To be confirmed
Demolition of old school	To be confirmed
Externals Complete	To be confirmed

#### 7. Options

Three capital cost options have been developed (see Appendix 1) for each school as part of the options appraisal exercise:

- Do minimum existing schools refurbished and upgraded in selected areas to produce a building with a residual life of 12 years but with no improvement in functionality or capacity;
- Full Refurbishment existing schools refurbished and upgraded to produce a building with a residual life of 25 years with increased capacity but no improvement in functionality;
- **New Build** new energy efficient schools built on the existing sites to modern standards with required functionality and capacity for forecast pupil capacity.

It was agreed that that the driving force behind the investment decision should be a combination of 'needs based' and 'buildings driven'. The criteria was focused on Suitability, Condition and Sufficiency, this is in line with the current prioritisation model used for the school estate.

Each capital cost option was therefore the subject of a non-financial and financial appraisal, with the optimum solution being based on a Value for Money Rating which combined both appraisals.

In order to appraise the options, the following actions were taken forward:

- Establish the condition of the existing Tulloch and Kinross primary school buildings (including temporary buildings) and determine the residual life of key components and the buildings as a whole;
- Develop a refurbishment cost model for bringing each school up to an agreed standard and a capital cost programme for retaining the buildings at an agreed standard;
- Develop a new build design concept for each school recognising work already undertaken on other recent new Perth and Kinross Council primary schools;
- Evaluate the site abnormals and associated site development costs of a new build solution on the existing site of each school;
- Develop an indicative capital cost and 25 year whole life cost model for the new build design concept as a comparator against the refurbishment option for each school.

A summary of the options is contained as Appendix 1.

The options considered are as follows:

Ref	Option	Accepted/Rejected	Outcome
(a)	Do Minimum	Rejected	Option a) is the lowest value for money based on the whole life cost calculation and how well it meets non-financial criteria based on suitability, condition and sufficiency (capacity). The school will need replaced in 12 years.
(b)	Full Refurbishment	Rejected	Option b) is the best financially; however it does not meet the non-financial requirements as well as option c) and is therefore not the best value for money. The school will need replaced in 25 years (although this would take it beyond the known lifespan for this type of school).
(c)	New Build Replacement	Accepted	Option c) is the best value for money option i.e. the best combination of financial and non-financial criteria. The new school will not need replaced for at least 60 years.

#### Recommendation

The preferred option of Education and Children's Services is to take forward Option (c) a new build replacement.

#### 8. Value/Cost Analysis

# Capital

The indicative cost of replacing Kinross Primary School on a like for like basis is £12.1m. The costing exercise was carried out to calculate value for money figures for the options appraisal. It is based on current prices, has not been market tested and is not based on a completed design or construction programme. The financial analysis identifies a number of risks including site conditions and asbestos. It does not include increased Early Years provision or Additional Support Needs (ASN) provision at this point.

#### Revenue

Revenue costs cannot be established until the project design is confirmed. This will require ECS Senior Management Team to submit an expenditure pressure with a corresponding saving through the revenue budget process.

# 9. Major Risks

Risk Description	Impact (High; Med; Low)	Probability (High; Med; Low)	Action Plan to mitigate risk
Insufficient capital funding	Medium	Medium	The HubCo process sets an affordability cap at an early stage and costs are revisited at Stage 1 and Stage 2. Consideration must be given to meeting Scottish Futures Trust Metrics and standards in developing the design as part of the funding conditions. Additional requirements eg for Early Years will have to be met from other budgets.
Risk of failure of fabric of the existing building	Medium	Low	The options appraisal has recommended an annual survey and remediation works until the new school is operational.
Failure to meet the March 2018 deadline set by the Scottish Government	High	Low	The options appraisal has already carried out preparatory work. There is no requirement for a statutory consultation.
Project not adequately resourced	High	Medium	A project manager has been identified. Work is ongoing to revise the overall capital programme resources.

Building is life-expired	Strengths	Costs	Weaknesses
	Lowest capital cost	Capital £3,974,314	School will need replaced in 12 years
Building requires		<ul> <li>Building Operating Costs</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Highest operating costs</li> </ul>
significant expenditure		£146,000 per annum	<ul> <li>Temporary accommodation still in use</li> </ul>
to maintain			<ul> <li>No improvement in functionality or</li> </ul>
			suitability of school
			<ul> <li>Lowest value for money rating</li> </ul>
			Will not accommodate any increase in
Summary: Option a) is the	Option a) is the lowest value for money based on the whole	life cost calculation and how well it	on the whole life cost calculation and how well it meets non-financial criteria based on
suitability, condition and s		eplaced in 12 years.	
Option b) Full Refurb	shment - existing school refurbished and upgr	aded to produce a building with a residu	Option b) Full Refurbishment – existing school refurbished and upgraded to produce a building with a residual life of 25 years with increased capacity but no
improvement in functionality;	ality;	-	-
Key Drivers	Strengths	Costs	Weaknesses
Building is life-expired	<ul> <li>Extends life of school by 25 years</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Capital £6,156,812</li> </ul>	School will need replaced in 25 years
Building requires	<ul> <li>Limits the capital required in the short</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Building Operating costs</li> </ul>	Temporary accommodation still in use
significant expenditure	term	£140,000 per annum	<ul> <li>No improvement in functionality or</li> </ul>
to maintain			suitability of school
			<ul> <li>Partial decant required</li> </ul>
Summary: Option b) is the value for money. The school	Summary: Option b) is the best financially; however it does not meet the non-financial requirements as well as option c) and is therefore not the best value for money. The school will need replaced in 25 years (although this would take it beyond the known lifespan for this type of school).	he non-financial requirements as well; his would take it beyond the known	II as option c) and is therefore not the best ifespan for this type of school).
Option c) New Build –	Option c) New Build – new energy efficient school built on the existing sites to modern standards with required functionality and capacity for forecast pubil	sites to modern standards with require	d functionality and capacity for forecast pupil
capacity.			
Key Drivers	Strengths	Costs	Weaknesses
Building is life-expired	<ul> <li>New school should last at least 60</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Capital £12,107,950</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Greatest capital cost</li> </ul>
Building requires	years	<ul> <li>Building Operating Costs</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Temporary reduction in play and sports</li> </ul>
significant expenditure	<ul> <li>Improvement in the suitability/</li> </ul>	£121,000 per annum	space while build takes place
to maintain	functionality of school supporting new teaching practices and also the		
	opportunity to improve Early Years and		
	Additional Support Needs provision		
	<ul> <li>Highest Value for money – based on</li> </ul>		
	Tinancial costs and non-tinancial criteria		



# **Outline Business Case**

Title:	Tulloch Pri School	imary	Executive Sponsor	John Fyffe
Business Plan	Ref:	Version 1	Senior Responsible Owner	Sheena Devlin
Author:	Carol Taylo	or	Date:	20 October 2014

#### 1. Executive Summary

In setting the capital budget for 2017/18 – 2019/20, £8.5m was approved towards replacing schools of the same construction as Oakbank Primary School. There are two primary schools of the same construction type; these are Kinross Primary School and Tulloch Primary School.

In March 2014, the Council commissioned a Strategic Options Appraisal to determine the most appropriate capital investment strategy for both Kinross and Tulloch Primary Schools.

The options appraisal concluded that both Kinross and Tulloch Primary Schools should be replaced as soon as funding became available.

On 10 October 2014, the Scottish Government announced two thirds funding contribution towards both Kinross and Tulloch Primary Schools.

#### 2. Introduction

The Education (Scotland) Act 1980 states that Councils have a statutory duty to make adequate and efficient provision of school education across their entire area for the current school population and future pattern of demand. In addition, they have a responsibility to achieve Best Value as outlined in the Local Government in Scotland Act 2003.

In order to ensure good asset management practice, work has been done to establish Performance Indicators, on which the prioritisation of the Capital Investment Programme for primary schools can be based. A model has been developed based on the current core facts, condition, suitability and potential occupancy based on the effect of new house building on school roll projections. Each of these criteria has then been weighted to give an overall prioritised score for each school with a clear indication of where capital resources require to be targeted.

On 30 August 2012, the School Estate Sub Committee approved the draft School Estate Strategy (Report No. 12/370 refers). Click on the following link for further details: schoolestatesubstrategy21082012v1.doc

This strategic approach embraces the Service's vision of a confident and ambitious Perth and Kinross with a strong identity and clear outcomes that everyone works together to achieve. Our area will be vibrant and successful; a safe, secure and healthy environment; and a place where people and communities are nurtured and supported. Our key service priorities support the delivery of our commitments in the Single Outcome Agreement and Corporate Plan, helping Education & Children's Services (ECS) to focus on the local outcomes that will achieve meaningful improvements for our stakeholders. In summary this project specifically links to the Single Outcome Agreement Local Outcomes 5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13 and 15. These link to Education and Children's Services priorities:

#### They are:

- Raising achievement for all;
- Supporting vulnerable children and families;
- Improving the quality of life for individuals and communities; and

Enabling the delivery of high qualify public services.

In addition to the ECS policy framework areas, it is important to recognise emerging priorities within the Council and plan for these. The four strategic themes listed below are the current EOT sponsorship of the political priorities. This project will be taken forward in line with these priorities:

- Getting it Right for Every Child (GIRFEC)
- Health and Social Care Integration
- Public Protection
- Regeneration (Social, Physical, Economic)

#### 2.1. Current Position

In March 2014, the Council commissioned a Strategic Options Appraisal to determine the most appropriate capital investment strategy for both Kinross and Tulloch Primary Schools.

The options appraisal concluded that both Kinross and Tulloch Primary Schools should be replaced as soon as funding became available.

Tulloch Primary School can be replaced on the existing site but there is a requirement to decant the school while the work takes place due to restrictions on the size and shape of the site. The options appraisal was based on 14 classrooms. This would incorporate potential additional capacity through house building. Consideration will have to be given to increasing Early Years provision to accommodate new legislative requirements related to 600 hours and 2 year olds. Additional Support Needs (ASN) accommodation has been incorporated into the appraisal for Tulloch as it is a current provision.

On 10 October 2014, the Scottish Government announced two thirds funding contribution towards both Kinross and Tulloch Primary Schools.

#### 3. Benefits

Education & Children's Services has a statutory duty to provide education services at a local level which requires response to an ever-changing landscape. We must ensure that the school buildings are appropriate to respond to both national and local curricular variations. We must ensure that we provide excellent schools that make a positive contribution to local communities. This project allows Education & Children's Services to meet the above challenges and uses resources available in a way that provides best value yet also provides the optimum benefits, including:

- Provide accommodation to allow the delivery of the functions of Education and Children's Services in a way which meets the needs of children and families both now and in the future:
- Provide accommodation that ensures the curriculum offered will meet the needs of all learners:
- Provide enhanced Early Learning and Child Care services;
- Reduce overall running costs and ongoing maintenance burdens;
- Safeguard the interests of the Council;
- Provide accommodation that is compliant with current legislative standards;

- Provide a safe, secure and welcoming environment to suit the needs of all users of the establishments;
- Meet the needs of the current and future known roll projections;
- Provide accommodation that supports inclusion and equality;
- Provide opportunities for the use of new technology; and
- Provide accommodation that focuses on the needs and aspirations of young people.

# 4. Objectives

The project aims to:

The key objectives of Education and Children's services which this project is intended to support are:

- Ensure learners in Perth and Kinross will have the opportunity to access learning throughout life in a positive, coherent and supportive framework;
- Promote the change and improvement of the service we provide;
- Meet the needs of key stakeholders ensuring shared and agreed priorities through integrated working;
- Provide a Service that demonstrates inclusion, equality and joint working throughout;
- Ensure sustainable development.

#### 5. Critical Success Factors

Education & Children's Services buildings must remain flexible and adaptable to respond to the range of initiatives and developments that are likely to emerge in the future both for the school community and the wider community. They must deliver an estate that has consistent standards in terms of building design and facilities and be in line with the outcomes of the Single Outcome Agreement.

The key success factors of this project will be:

- Ensure compliance with current legislative standards ie Education (Scotland)
   Act; Equality Act 2010 and Building Bulletin guidance etc;
- Sufficient capital funding to meet the demands;
- Sufficient staff resources to support the project;
- Sufficient timescale to deliver the project;
- · Receipt of appropriate statutory consents;
- Reduce energy costs and carbon emission reductions.

#### 6. Key Activities

The key milestones for the project are as follows:

Activity	Milestone
Submit bid under Phase 3 of the Scotland's Schools for the Future programme	July 2012
Confirmation of unsuccessful bid under Phase 3 of the Scotland's Schools for the Future programme	September 2012
Bid to CRG for funding as part of the 2017/18 to 19/20 capital budget process	October 2012
Bid to Scottish Government Scotland's Schools for the Future funding	July 2014
Options appraisal to determine the best solution for this building	September 2014
Strategic Policy and Resources approval of funding	October 2014
Lifelong Learning Committee approval of projects	October 2014
New Project Request submitted to HubCo	To be confirmed
Stage 1 approval	To be confirmed
Stage 2 approval	To be confirmed
Decant and Demolition	To be confirmed
Construction Start	To be confirmed
Construction Complete	To be confirmed
School Operational	To be confirmed
Externals Complete	To be confirmed

# 7. Options

Three capital cost options have been developed for each school (a summary is contained in Appendix 1) as part of the options appraisal exercise:

- Do minimum existing schools refurbished and upgraded in selected areas to produce a building with a residual life of 12 years but with no improvement in functionality or capacity
- Full Refurbishment existing schools refurbished and upgraded to produce a building with a residual life of 25 years with increased capacity but no improvement in functionality
- New Build new energy efficient schools built on the existing sites to modern standards with required functionality and capacity for forecast pupil capacity

It was agreed that that the driving force behind the investment decision should be a combination of 'needs based' and 'buildings driven'. The criteria was focused on Suitability, Condition and Sufficiency, this is in line with the current prioritisation model used for the school estate.

Each capital cost option was therefore the subject of a non-financial and financial appraisal, with the optimum solution being based on a Value for Money Rating which combined both appraisals.

In order to achieve this, the following actions were taken forward:

- Establish the condition of the existing Tulloch and Kinross primary school buildings (including temporary buildings) and determine the residual life of key components and the buildings as a whole;
- Develop a refurbishment cost model for bringing each school up to an agreed standard and a capital cost programme for retaining the buildings at an agreed standard;
- Develop a new build design concept for each school recognising work already undertaken on other recent new Perth and Kinross Council primary schools;
- Evaluate the site abnormals and associated site development costs of a new build solution on the existing site of each school;
- Develop an indicative capital cost and 25 year whole life cost model for the new build design concept as a comparator against the refurbishment option for each school.

The following options have been used as an outline scope for the projects being considered within this scheme.

Ref	Option	Accepted/Rejected	Outcome
(a)	Do Minimum	Rejected	Option (a) is the lowest value for money based on the whole life cost calculation and how well it meets non-financial criteria based on suitability, condition and sufficiency (capacity). The school will need replaced in 12 years.
(b)	Full Refurbishment	Rejected	Option (b) is the best financially; however it does not meet the non-financial requirements as well as option (c) and is therefore not the best value for money. The school will need replaced in 25 years (although this would take it beyond the known lifespan for this type of school).
(c)	New Build Replacement	Accepted	Option (c) is the best value for money option i.e. the best combination of financial and non-financial criteria. The new school will not need replaced for at least 60 years.

#### Recommendation

The preferred option of Education and Children's Services is to take forward Option (c) a new build replacement.

# 8 Value/Cost Analysis

# Capital

The indicative cost of replacing Tulloch Primary School on a like for like basis is £11.8m. The costing exercise was carried out to calculate value for money figures for the options appraisal. It is based on current prices, has not been market tested and is not based on a completed design. The financial analysis identifies a number of risks including site conditions and asbestos. It does not include increased Early Years provision.

#### Revenue

Revenue costs cannot be established until the project design is confirmed. This will require ECS Senior Management Team to submit an expenditure pressure with a corresponding saving through the revenue budget process.

# **Major Risks**

Risk Description	Impact (High; Med; Low)	Probability (High; Med; Low)	Action Plan to mitigate risk
Insufficient capital funding	Medium	Medium	The HubCo process sets an affordability cap at an early stage and costs are revisited at Stage 1 and Stage 2.  Consideration must be given to meeting Scottish Futures Trust Metrics and standards in developing the design as part of the funding conditions.
			Additional requirements eg for Early Years will have to be met from other budgets.
Risk of failure of fabric of the existing building	Medium	Low	The options appraisal has recommended an annual survey and remediation works until the new school is operational.
Failure to meet the March 2018 deadline set by the Scottish Government	High	Low	The options appraisal has already carried out preparatory work. There is no requirement for a statutory consultation.

Risk Description	Impact (High; Med; Low)	Probability (High; Med; Low)	Action Plan to mitigate risk
Project not adequately resourced	High	Medium	A project manager has been identified. Work is ongoing to revise the overall capital programme resources.
Solution does not address roll pressures within the catchment area.	Medium	Low	The brief will be developed to address roll pressures or alternative solutions will be sought.

• Capital £3,314,989 • Building Operating costs £118,000 per annum  • Capital £5,550,473 • Building Operating costs £96,000 • Per annum  • Capital £5,550,473 • Building Operating costs £96,000 • Per annum  • Capital £1,501,473 • Building Operating costs £96,000 • Per annum  • Capital £1,801,366 • Capital £11,801,366 • Building Operating costs • Building Operating costs • Capital £11,801,366 • Building Operating costs • Building Operating costs • Building Operating costs • Building Operating costs • E109,000 per annum • •	is life-expired • requires			
Building is life-expired     Building coperating costs significant expenditure     building requires significant expenditure     to maintain     to maint	•	engths	Costs	Weaknesses
significant expenditure significant expenditure to maintain to mai	Building requires     significant expenditure	Lowest capital cost	<ul> <li>Capital £3,314,989</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>School will need replaced in 12 years</li> </ul>
significant expenditure to maintain  Summary: Option a) is the lowest value for money based on the whole life cost calculation and suitability of school of potton b). Full Refurbishment – existing school refurbished and upgraded to produce a building with a residual life of 25 years with increased companient in functionality.  Key Drivers  Summary: Option a) is the lowest value for money based on the whole life cost calculation and sufficiency (capacity). The school will need replaced in 12 years.  Expublicant expenditure  Sunding is life-expired  Summary: Option b) is the lowest value for money based on the whole life cost calculation and how well it meets non-financial criteria base suitability.  Key Drivers  Sulding requires  Sunding is life-expired  Summary: Option b) is the best financially; however it does not meet the non-financial requirements as well as option c) and is therefore no value for money. The school will need replaced in 25 years (although this would take it beyond the known lifespan for this type of school)  Option to New Build- new energy efficient expenditure  Building requires  Sunding is life-expired  Sunding school should last at least 60  Building Operating costs  Building operating costs  Building operating costs  Building operating costs  Casts  Casts  Casts  Reportment in the suitability/  E109,000 per amum  Bobbard additional support Needs provision  Highest Value for money—based on the word of supporting reposition in play a space while build takes place functionally descended in the suitability of school supporting repaired on the contract of the contract of the contract while build takes place functionally to improve Early Years and Additional Support Needs provision  Highest Value for money—based on the contract of the contract of the contract while build takes place the contract while build takes place the contract while build takes place the contract while build takes the contract of the contract	annificant avnanditura		<ul> <li>Building Operating costs</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Highest operating costs</li> </ul>
Summary: Option a) is the lowest value for money based on the whole life cost calculation and sufficiency (capacity). The school will need replaced in 12 years.  Option b) Full Refurbishment – existing school refurbished and upgraded to produce a building with a residual life of 25 years with increased commondate any increased compromed to the school will need replaced in 12 years.  Option b) Full Refurbishment – existing school refurbished and upgraded to produce a building with a residual life of 25 years with increased compromed in functionality.  Key Drivers  Strengths  Expondition and sufficiency (capacity). The school will need replaced in 12 years.  Building is life-expired  I mint she capital required in the short to maintain  Summary: Option b) is the best financially; however it does not meet the non-financial requirements as well as option c) and is therefore no capacity.  Summary: Option b) is the best financially; however it does not meet the non-financial requirements as well as option c) and is therefore no capacity.  Summary: Option b) is the best financially; however it does not meet the non-financial requirements as well as option c) and is therefore no capacity.  Summary: Option b) is the best financially; however it does not meet the non-financial requirements as well as option c) and is therefore no capacity.  Strengths  Summary: Option b) is the best financially; however it does not meet the non-financial requirements as well as option c) and is therefore no capacity.  Strengths  Summary: Option b) is the best financially of school built on the existing sites to modern standards with required functionality of school supportunity to improve Early Years and also the more properturity to improve Early Years and also the more properturity to improve Early Years and Additional Support Needs provision financial orders and non-financial criefs and one-financial criefs and o	אלוווויסמוור בעליבו ומונמוב		£118,000 per annum	<ul> <li>No improvement in functionality or</li> </ul>
Summary: Option a) is the lowest value for money based on the whole life cost calculation and how well it meets non-financial criteria base suitability, condition and sufficiency (capacity). The school will need replaced in 12 years.  Option b) Full Refurbishment – existing school refurbished and upgraded to produce a building with a residual life of 25 years with increased compared to money and increased companies.  Exercise the school will need replaced in 25 years and significant expenditure to maintain the capital required in the short significant expenditure of the school will need replaced in 25 years (and the short of maintain)  Summary: Option b) is the best financially; however it does not meet the non-financial requirements as well as option c) New Build – new energy efficient school built on the existing sites to modern standards with required functionality of school supporting new reaching practices and also the coportunity to improve Early Years significant expenditure opportunity to improve Early Years significant expenditure and also the coportunity to improve Early Years and also the coportunity to improve Larly Years and also the financial requirements as well as option and additional Support Needs provision financial requirements as well as option and additional Support Needs provision financial requirements and also the coportunity to improve Early Years and also the coportunity to improve Early Years and also the coportunity to improve Pased on the coportunity of school should be approximated to the coportunity of school supportunity of coportunity of school supportunity of prove Early Years and also the coportunity of school supportunity of school supp	to maintain			suitability of school
Summary: Option a) is the lowest value for money based on the whole life cost calculation and sufficiency (capacity). The school will need replaced in 12 years.  Option b) Full Kerturisishment – existing school refurbished and upgraded to produce a building with a residual life of 25 years with increased or improvement in functionality.  Key Drivers  Building is life-expired  Summary: Option b) is the best financially; however it does not meet the non-financial requirements as well as option c) and is therefore no value for money. The school will need replaced in 25 years (although this would take it beyond the known lifespan for this type of school).  Summary: Option b) is the best financially; however it does not meet the non-financial requirements as well as option c) and is therefore no value for money. The school will need replaced in 25 years (although this would take it beyond the known lifespan for this type of school).  Summary: Option b) is the best financially; however it does not meet the non-financial requirements as well as option c) and is therefore no value for money. The school will need replaced in 25 years (although this would take it beyond the known lifespan for this type of school).  Costs  Building is life-expired  Option c) New Build — new energy efficient school built on the existing sites to modem standards with required functionality and capacity for fore-apacity.  Evaluation of the suitability of school supportuning new to maintain  Building sequires  Summary: Option b) is the best financially of school support Needs provision  Building sequires  Summary: Option b) is the best financial required functionality and capacity for proper provision  Building sequires  Summary: Option b) is the best financially of school support Needs provision  Building sequires  Summary: Option b) is the best financially the sum of the sum of this type of school support views of the peach of school support views of the sum of the				<ul> <li>Lowest value for money rating</li> </ul>
Summary: Option a) is the lowest value for money based on the whole life cost calculation and sufficiency (capacity). The school will need replaced in 12 years.  Option b) Full Returbishment – existing school refurbished and upgraded to produce a building with a residual life of 25 years with increased or improvement in functionality;  Key Drivers  Building sequires  Building sequires  Building sequires  Summary: Option b) is the best financially; however it does not meet the non-financial requirements as well as option c) and is therefore no value for money. The school will need replaced in 25 years  Building sequires  Summary: Option b) is the best financially; however it does not meet the non-financial requirements as well as option c) and is therefore no value for money. The school will need replaced in 25 years  Summary: Option b) is the best financially; however it does not meet the non-financial required functionality of school built on the existing sites to modern standards with required functionality of school supporting new teaching practices and also the opportunity to improve Early Years and Sufficient expenditure control of the cost of the opportunity of money – based on the financial cost of the opportunity of money – based on the financial cost of the opportunity of money – based on the financial cost of the opportunity of the cost of cost of the opportunity of money – based on the financial cost of the opportunity of the cost of cost of the cost of cost of the opportunity of cost of cost of the cost of cost of the cost of cost of cost of the cost of cost of cost of cost of the cost of cost of cost of the cost of cost of the cost of cost of cost of the cost of cost of cost of cost of the cost of cost of cost of the cost of cost of cost of cost of the cost of cost of cost of the cost of co				<ul> <li>Will not accommodate any increase in</li> </ul>
Summary: Option a) is the lowest value for money based on the whole life cost calculation and sufficiency (capacity). The school will need replaced in 12 years.  Option b) Full Refutbishment – existing school refurbished and upgraded to produce a building with a residual life of 25 years with increased of improvement in functionality.  Key Drivers  Building requires  Building requires  Building requires  Summary: Option b) is the best financially; however it does not meet the non-financial requirements as well as option c) and is therefore no value for money. The school will need replaced in 25 years (although this would take it beyond the known lifespan for this type of school).  Coption c) New Build – new energy efficient school built on the existing sites to modern standards with required functionality of school supporting new to maintain the suitability.  Exerpited  New school should last at least 60  Building operating costs £96.000  Costial £71.801,366  Building operating costs £96.000  Bocant while build takes place financially force Early Years and Additional Support Needs provision  Building operating costs financially takes place financial costs and also the expection of the part of the part of the financial costs and also the financial costs and als				capacity
Option b) Full Refurbishment – existing school refurbished and upgraded to produce a building with a residual life of 25 years with increased carried improvement in functionality.         Costs         Weaknesses           • Building is life-expired to maintain to maintain to maintain to maintain to maintain         • Limits the capital required in the short to maintain         • Capital £5,550,473         • School will need replaced in 25 years           • Building requires significant expenditure         • Limits the capital required in the short to maintain         • Building Operating costs £96,000         • No improvement in functional suits need replaced in 25 years (although this would take it beyond the known lifespan for this type of school).         • No improvement in functionality of school outly 25 years (although this would take it beyond the known lifespan for this type of school).         • No improvement in functionality of school outly of the capital cost in the existing sites to modern standards with required functionality and capacity for fore capacity.         • Capital £5,550,473         • No improvement in functionality of school supporting new teaching practices and also the capacity of school supporting new teaching practices and also the capacity of school supporting new teaching practices and also the capacity of the formony – based on the capacity of the formony – the capacity of the formony – based on the capacity of the formony – based on the capacity of the formony – the capacity of the formony – the capacity of the formo	Summary: Option a) is the lowe suitability, condition and suffici	est value for money based on the whole iency (capacity). The school will need r	ife cost calculation and how well it n eplaced in 12 years.	ieets non-financial criteria based on
	Option b) Full Refurbishme	ent - existing school refurbished and upgra	aded to produce a building with a residua	Il life of 25 years with increased capacity but no
	nent in iunctional	:		
		engths	Costs	Weaknesses
	<ul> <li>Building is life-expired</li> </ul>	Extends life of school by 25 years	<ul> <li>Capital £5,550,473</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>School will need replaced in 25 years</li> </ul>
	Building requires	Limits the capital required in the short	<ul> <li>Building Operating costs £96,000</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No improvement in functionality or</li> </ul>
	significant expenditure	term	per annum	suitability of school
	to maintain			
strengths  Strengths  Strengths  Strengths  Strengths  Strengths  Strengths  Strengths  New school should last at least 60  The expired strengths  The expired strength required functional strengths  The expired strength required functional strengths  The expired strengths  T	Summary: Option b) is the best value for money. The school w		he non-financial requirements as well his would take it beyond the known li	as option c) and is therefore not the best espan for this type of school).
Strengths       Costs       Wea         • New school should last at least 60 requires       • New school should last at least 60 required       • Capital £11,801,366 registered       • Building Operating costs       • E109,000 per annum functionality of school supporting new teaching practices and also the opportunity to improve Early Years and Additional Support Needs provision       • Highest Value for money – based on financial costs and functional Support in the suitability of school support Needs provision       • Highest Value for money – based on financial costs and support in the suitability functional Support Needs provision       • Highest Value for money – based on financial costs and support in the suitability functional Support Needs provision       • Highest Value for money – based on financial costs and support in the suitability functional Support Needs provision       • Highest Value for money – based on financial costs and support in the suitability functional Support Needs provision       • Highest Value for money – based on financial costs and support Needs provision	Option c) New Build – new capacity.		sites to modern standards with required	functionality and capacity for forecast pupil
<ul> <li>New school should last at least 60</li> <li>years</li> <li>Improvement in the suitability/ functionality of school supporting new teaching practices and also the opportunity to improve Early Years and Additional Support Needs provision</li> <li>Highest Value for money – based on financial screte and non-financial screte and non-financi</li></ul>		engths	Costs	Weaknesses
<ul> <li>years</li> <li>Improvement in the suitability/ functionality of school supporting new teaching practices and also the opportunity to improve Early Years and Additional Support Needs provision</li> <li>Highest Value for money – based on financial scete and non-financial screte and non-financial scret</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Building is life-expired</li> </ul>	New school should last at least 60	<ul> <li>Capital £11,801,366</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Greatest capital cost</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Improvement in the suitability/ functionality of school supporting new teaching practices and also the opportunity to improve Early Years and Additional Support Needs provision</li> <li>Highest Value for money – based on financial scete and non-financial screte and non-financial</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Building requires</li> </ul>	years	<ul> <li>Building Operating costs</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Temporary reduction in play and sports</li> </ul>
functionality of school supporting new teaching practices and also the opportunity to improve Early Years and Additional Support Needs provision  Highest Value for money – based on	significant expenditure •	Improvement in the suitability/	£109,000 per annum	space while build takes place
opportunity to improve Early Years and Additional Support Needs provision  • Highest Value for money – based on financial ports and mon-financial partients	to maintain	functionality of school supporting new teaching practices and also the		<ul> <li>Decant while build takes place</li> </ul>
Highest Value for money – based on financial costs and non-financial cost		opportunity to improve Early Years and Additional Support Needs provision		
מוסומ המסוף מות ה	•	Highest Value for money – based on financial costs and non-financial criteria		