

<b>DECISION-MAKER:</b>	CABINET
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	SECONDARY SCHOOL ESTATE PROGRAMME 2011/12
<b>DATE OF DECISION:</b>	26 SEPTEMBER 2011
<b>REPORT OF:</b>	CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES AND LEARNING
<b>STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY</b>	
None	

### **BRIEF SUMMARY**

At the Cabinet Meeting of 06/06/11, it was agreed to add £4,500,000 to the Children's Services and Learning (CSL) Capital Programme for the purpose of addressing key maintenance and suitability issues across the City's secondary school estate. The associated report stated that proposals for the investment profile at individual schools were being developed, with a view to bringing these back to Cabinet to request approval to spend on each of these items.

The purpose of the current report is to set out the final investment proposals for each of the schools in question and to seek approval to spend against these.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

In accordance with the Education Acts and having had regard to s2 Local Government Act 2000 and the provisions of the Community Strategy:

- (i) To vire, in accordance with the Financial Procedure Rules, a sum of £4,500,000 from the Secondary School Estate Capital budget to the following schemes:
  - £650,000 Bitterne Park Capital Investment
  - £670,000 Chamberlayne College Capital Investment
  - £650,000 Regents Park Capital Investment
  - £575,000 Sholing Tech. Capital Investment
  - £600,000 St. Anne's Capital Investment
  - £520,000 St. George Capital Investment
  - £485,000 Upper Shirley High Capital Investment
  - £350,000 Secondary Investment Programme Contingency
- (ii) To approve, in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules, capital expenditure of £4,500,000 from the Children's Services & Learning Capital Programme, for investment in the secondary school estate.

### **REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The secondary school estate has a significant profile of backlog maintenance issues. This is due, in part, to the fact that investment in ongoing maintenance had been reduced when it had been thought that the secondary estate would be largely rebuilt under Building Schools for the Future. In the absence of this investment, it is now critical that a programme be formulated to address key maintenance and suitability issues across the estate.

2. The proposals contained within this report were developed by CSL's Strategy and Capital Programme Team, on the basis of a reasoned assessment of schools' condition surveys and discussions with Heads regarding suitability items. The proposals have been agreed by all of the secondary schools concerned as comprising a solution that addresses the most pressing issues, whilst ensuring an equitable distribution of resources across the estate. As these proposals provide a platform for commonly agreeable solution, it is proposed that they be approved and actioned.

### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

3. In addition to the proposals that form the subject of this report, two other options for the allocation of the secondary investment pot were put to schools for their consideration. The first was a condition-driven set of proposals, meaning that the capital pot was allocated to schools solely on the basis of the items identified within their condition surveys. As condition items are given a priority score, the secondary estate was taken as a whole and the "top" £4.5m worth of issues identified to be addressed. This option had the advantage of being entirely transparent and objectively-determined. However, the option also had a number of key drawbacks, which the schools felt outweighed the advantages:
  - An inequitable distribution of investment, with, at the extremes, some schools receiving up to a 390% greater investment profile than others; and
  - An inability for schools to have input into the issues that they would like to see addressed, owing to the fact that the identification of priority items was based solely on the content of the condition surveys. This meant that "suitability" items (such as the need for additional toilets) could not be factored-in and, since a number of schools deemed these latter items to be more pressing than the condition issues, they found this option to be unpalatable.
4. The second discarded option was a mix of the other two (i.e. the judgement-based and the condition driven options). Again, this was rejected, due to the perceived lack of flexibility that this provided schools with in determining the focus of the investment.

### **DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)**

5. As alluded to above, the proposals contained within this report were the subject of extensive consultation. The process of developing the preferred solution was broken-down as follows:
  - Initial Meetings with Schools – these were held with individual schools in April 2011, to go through their priorities for investment, together with consideration of the key issues identified within the condition surveys pertaining to their buildings.

- Presentation to Secondary Heads Forum – after all schools had been met individually, two options for investment were worked up by the Strategy & Capital Programme Team and brought to the Secondary Heads Forum. The options presented were the one that forms the basis of the proposals in this paper and the condition-driven option. Heads were divided on which of the two options was preferable and the Forum asked the Strategy & Capital Programme Team to develop a third option (a mix of the other two options) for consideration.
  - Meeting with Building Surveyors – after having developed all three options, the Strategy & Capital Programme Team met with Capita’s Building Surveying Department to discuss the proposals in detail. This led to a few amendments to the proposals, which ensured that all of the urgent condition issues were picked up.
  - Decision on Preferred Option – on 23 June 2011, the three developed options were presented to the Secondary Heads Forum, with a view to establishing agreement on the preferred way forward. After debating the issues, it was collectively agreed that the judgement-based option was the fairest and most flexible basis upon which to proceed. The agreed option forms the basis of this paper.
  - Follow-up Meetings with Schools – having agreed the proposals for spend at each school, a final set of meetings with individual schools was undertaken to brief them on the process going forward.
6. The proposed capital investment profile at each of SCC’s (non-PFI) secondary schools is detailed below. A summary of all of the proposals contained in this report is provided in *Appendix 1*.
7. Bitterne Park Capital Investment
- The school has a significant backlog maintenance schedule. However, the buildings in greatest need of repair (and also which have significant suitability issues associated with them) are those which comprise the school’s Maths Block. As such, it is proposed that a project is formulated to reconfigure and refurbish this area of the school. As the buildings in question are modular classrooms, it is proposed that they be remodelled, in order to deliver a more “permanent” structure. A high-level feasibility study on the works required to deliver this has been undertaken and has estimated a project cost of between £1.0m and £1.3m. As such, it is proposed to phase the project in order that contract formation is scheduled for the 2012/13 financial year (to allow two year’s worth of capital funding for the school to be rolled into one project). The project will not be approved to proceed to implementation until such time as the 2012/13 capital allocation is determined to be sufficient to finance this. If insufficient funding were to be forthcoming to the authority (e.g. as a consequence of the school transferring to Academy status prior to this point), then the investment would be sought from the school and/or the DfE to meet the funding deficit. Should such additional funding be unavailable, the project would be reconfigured and/or descoped accordingly. The funding allocated to the project from the 2011/12 capital allocation is £650,000.

8. Chamberlayne College Capital Investment

Chamberlayne also has a significant amount of backlog maintenance required. As such, investment at this school is being directed to items identified on its condition survey. Specifically, it is proposed that resources are allocated to the following items:

- £255,000 for the replacement of windows and window frames;
- £145,000 for the reinstatement of roof coverings;
- £200,000 for the replacement of pipework; and
- £70,000 for the installation of improved lighting.

The above items represent all of the condition issues that were highlighted in the school's condition survey as being of highest priority.

9. Regents Park Capital Investment

Regents Park is in a similar position to the two preceding schools. Again, it is proposed that investment in condition issues is a key priority, with the identified items in this respect being as follows:

- £180,000 for the replacement of windows and window frames;
- £160,000 for the reconfiguration of the fire alarm system and
- £100,000 for the encasing of external staircases, which presently pose a significant Health & safety risk.

In addition, there are a number of suitability items that the school requires in order to support its curriculum delivery and bring the buildings in line with national guidance, as detailed below:

- £160,000 for an additional toilet block, which is required to provide for the fact that the school was redesignated as coeducational under *Learning Futures*; and
- £50,000 for drainage to the schools only grass pitch, which is prone to water-logging, making it unusable for a large portion of the year.

10. Sholing Tech. Capital Investment

Sholing Tech. has a moderate backlog maintenance schedule, compared to its Southampton peers. It is proposed that investment at this school is directed towards the following condition items:

- £245,000 for the replacement of windows and window frames; and
- £170,000 for the reinstatement of roof coverings.

Furthermore, as with Regents Park, there is also a need for an additional toilet block at this school, in order to take account of its recently becoming coeducational. Again, it is proposed that a sum of £160,000 be allocated for this purpose.

11. St. Anne's Capital Investment

There is a significant backlog maintenance schedule at St. Anne's. However, the major priority item is the replacement of the heating pipework throughout the school. It is estimated that £300,000 would be sufficient to remedy this issue in its entirety.

Further to the above, the school has identified the fact that they would like to initiate a project to refurbish the disused onsite chapel, with a view to its being used as a performing arts space in the future. It is proposed that £300,000 be allocated to this project from the 2011/12 capital allocation. Although this amount will not meet the anticipated cost of delivering the full vision for this space, it should be sufficient to bring the area into a useable state of repair, with the option being retained to deliver further progress towards the vision from future capital allocations.

12. St. George Capital Investment

St. George is in a comparatively good state of repair. Discussion with building surveyors has identified that there is only one critical condition related issue requiring attention at the school; this being the roof of the Science Block. It is estimated that the reinstatement of this item will cost £120,000.

As there is significantly less need for condition works at St. George, the school have asked for a capital investment in delivering an all weather sports pitch. It is proposed that £400,000 be allocated for this purpose, which may be supplemented by investment by the school and/or funding from external bodies, depending on the specification of pitch required.

13. Upper Shirley High Capital Investment

Upper Shirley High has a moderate level of condition-related buildings issues. In this respect, it is proposed that investment be directed to the following:

- £150,000 for the reinstatement of roof coverings;
- £150,000 for the replacement of pipework; and
- £25,000 for the replacement of windows and window frames.

As with the other two schools that became coeducational under Learning Futures (see above), there is a need for an additional toilet block at Upper Shirley High. Again, £160,000 has been allocated to this within these proposals.

Although the school has recently become an Academy, SCC's Capital Maintenance allocation for 2011/12 was calculated on the basis of the authority having responsibility to maintain these buildings. Furthermore, the 14-19 Diplomas, SEN and Disabilities grant had been earmarked for BSF schools (of which Upper Shirley High was one). As such, there is no conflict in allocating a programme of works to this school within the current financial year. This position has been confirmed within the school's Transfer Agreement of 29 July 2011 and agreed contractually prior to the Local Authority ceasing to maintain the school.

14. Secondary Investment Programme Contingency

As the above amounts do not allow for contingency items, it is proposed that the remaining £350,000 be placed in a programme-level contingency fund. Managing the budget in this fashion (as opposed to at the level of individual projects) will allow greater flexibility in how it is employed.

## RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

### Capital/Revenue

15. £4.5 million was added to the Children's Services & Learning capital programme by Cabinet in June 2011, funded from Department for Education 14-19 Diplomas, SEN & Disabilities Grant.
16. The budgets for each project are detailed in Appendix 1 and summarised in the table below:

	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Bitterne Park Capital Investment	£50,000	£600,000	£650,000
Chamberlayne College Capital Investment	£670,000	£0	£670,000
Regents Park Capital Investment	£500,000	£150,000	£650,000
Sholing Tech. Capital Investment	£425,000	£150,000	£575,000
St. Anne's Capital Investment	£50,000	£550,000	£600,000
St. George Capital Investment	£170,000	£350,000	£520,000
Upper Shirley High Capital Investment	£335,000	£150,000	£485,000
Secondary Investment Contingency	£175,000	£175,000	£350,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£2,375,000</b>	<b>£2,125,000</b>	<b>£4,500,000</b>

17. The ongoing revenue costs of schools are met from the Individual Schools Budget funded from Dedicated Schools Grant.

### Property/Other

18. The additional resources being made available to address building condition issues and therefore reduce the maintenance backlog are welcomed.

## LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

### Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:

19. The Council has a variety of powers and duties in relation to the provision of appropriate secondary education (and facilities for the provision of such education) in relation to maintained schools under The Education Act 1996 and regulations made there under. In addition, the responsibilities in relation to the funding of capital matters in maintained schools is set out in the School Finance Regulations and the Scheme for Financing Schools approved under s.48 of the School standards & Frameworks Act 1998.
20. Upper Shirley high School is an Academy, not a maintained school. As such the Education Act provisions set out above do not apply. The Council has a power to assist Academy schools, including providing financial assistance, under s.2 Local Government Act 2000 if it is considered likely to improve the social, economic, or environmental well-being of its area or inhabitants of its area. The proposals for Upper Shirley high School have been assessed in line with the Council's approved Community Strategy and it is considered that the proposals set out in this report will improve the environmental and social well being of students at that school and is therefore within the Council's discretionary powers under the Act (see further Policy Framework Implications below).

### **Other Legal Implications:**

21. In preparing, considering and implementing the proposals in this report the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of the Equalities Act 2010.

### **POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS**

22. The capital investment proposed for SCC's secondary schools will contribute to the outcomes of both the 14-19 Strategy and the Children & Young People's Plan by improving the condition, suitability and efficiency of the estate in question.
23. In addition, capital investment in the City's secondary estate will contribute to Objective 2.3 of the council's *Community Strategy*. Specifically, improving secondary-age learning environments directly supports the Council's aim of "developing and sustaining successful... secondary schools that local people choose to send their children to."

<b>AUTHOR:</b>	Name:	Karl Limbert	Tel:	023 8091 7596
	E-mail:	<a href="mailto:karl.limbert@southampton.gov.uk">karl.limbert@southampton.gov.uk</a>		

**KEY DECISION?** Yes

**WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:**

All

### **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**Non-confidential appendices are in the Members' Rooms and can be accessed on-line**

#### **Appendices**

1.	Summary of Secondary Estate Investment Proposals
----	--

#### **Documents In Members' Rooms**

1.	None
----	------

#### **Integrated Impact Assessment**

Do the implications/subject of the report require an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) to be carried out.	No
--	----

#### **Other Background Documents**

**Integrated Impact Assessment and Other Background documents available for inspection at:**

Title of Background Paper(s)

Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)

1.	None	
----	------	--