

Education Capital Strategy

To: Children and Young People's Committee

Meeting Date: 17th January 2023

From: Executive Director of Children's Services

Electoral division(s): All

Key decision: No

Forward Plan ref: n/a

Outcome: The Committee is being asked to consider a range of approaches to:

- the identification of future basic need projects for inclusion in the Council's business plan
- the benchmarking of capital project costs to ensure that value for money is being achieved
- the output specification for school buildings; including the approach to net zero
- the routes to procurement and market testing the Council's current arrangements

The potential outcomes of the approach set out in this report is to seek to:

- limit the number of new projects coming forward, other than in the new year 5 of any future business plan during the annual review process, unless grant funded through other routes such as the Department for Education DEND Capital Safety Valve and the Free Schools programme
- to deliver the individual projects within the business plan within the agreed capital budgets but recognising the associated risks as set out in paragraph 4.1 of the report
- approve a policy position in relation to the delivery of education capital projects.

Recommendation: The Committee is recommended to:

- a) note the arrangement for the future consideration of basic need projects
- b) approve the approach to the future benchmarking of capital costs and in the absence of reliable comparison data market test our own procurement arrangements to provide this.

- c) approve the DfE schools output specification as the Council's baseline standard for design and that any variations other than those set out in section 2.3 of this report are agreed by the Capital Programme Board and the confirmation of this approach through a policy position.
- d) defer a decision on the re-procurement of the Council's consultant framework for 18 months to allow for (b) above and acknowledging the reduced pipeline of future capital projects

Voting arrangements: Co-opted members of the Committee are eligible to vote on this item.

Officer contact:

Name: Ian Trafford
Post: Strategic Education Capital Programme Manager
Email: ian.trafford@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 01223 699803

Member contacts:

Names: Councillors Bryony Goodliffe and Maria King
Post: Chair/Vice-Chair
Email: bryony.goodliffe@cambridgeshire.gov.uk maria.king@cambridgeshire.gov.uk;
Tel: 01223 706398 (office)

1. Background

- 1.1 The UK construction industry has been impacted by the legacy of post Covid recovery, post Brexit, and the rapid volatility of fuel and energy price rises and the war in the Ukraine. Demand has caused increased cost due to the global scarcity in the supply of commodities, rise in input costs in world markets and labour shortages. This has resulted in a sharp rise in the cost of construction works, as well as general inflation. Further impact has been caused by September's emergency mini budget causing a rise in the dollar to the pound and increase in UK interest rates. The increase in the cost of construction works far exceeds the rise in general inflation.
- 1.2 Since the commencement of the War in the Ukraine at the end of February 2022, the most significant increase in costs across all construction work packages has occurred. As a result, higher tender prices have been received exceeding pre-tender estimates of cost, resulting in requests for additional funding to be made. Previous estimates of cost for projects now in the design phase have also been forecast to rise further. No definitive update can be offered on when the situation will get back to normal in the foreseeable future, since there are too many external factors affecting availability and causing this surging price volatility. Demand is expected to stabilise eventually due to recession and reduced growth, but base build costs are unlikely to reduce to previous levels, as these supply side costs are now embedded and will be difficult to shift.
- 1.3 The outturn costs for major Education projects in Cambridgeshire tendered post March 2022 have increased by up to 20% above the approved budgets in the current business plan; whereas contract sums had increased by an average of 30.1%. Recent milestone cost estimates are indicating costs still rising since previously forecast in the order of 30% plus, with warning on others of potentially up to 40%. The most significant area of rise in costs appears to be the base build cost, i.e., the cost of inputs of materials, labour, and plant.
- 1.4 In response to these cost pressures this Committee considered a [review of Draft Revenue and Capital Business Planning Proposals for 2023-28](#) at its meeting on 29th November. The report outlined a renewed set of priorities and changes made at the individual scheme level. The recommendations of the CYP Committee will form part of the Council's 2023/4 business plan.
- 1.5 The purpose of this report is to set out an approach for the delivery of the individual capital schemes within the budgets established in the 2023/24 business plan. This is outlined in section 2 of the report.

2. Main Issues

2.1 Capital Programme Prioritisation

The Committee at its meeting on 29th November supported the outcome of a review of the capital programme against a renewed set of priorities focusing on the Council's statutory duty to ensure sufficient school places. This review has ensured the following:

- Schemes included are either directly linked to basic need for pupil places, aligned to the

most recent demography forecasts or a condition and maintenance issue required to ensure school buildings remain safe and dry

- Projected costs for projects are directly aligned wherever possible with the available funding stream via section 106, or basic need grant.
- Schemes have been reviewed to consider how delivery could be more cost effective and align with the wider education priorities, for example supporting small school viability.
- Funding sources have been reviewed to ensure all third-party contributions are updated and included within the correct financial year. In some cases, this has changed due to housing build out rate and section 106 trigger points.

2.1.1 At individual scheme level officers will ensure that options for the delivery of capital projects are an integral part of school place planning or school organisational reviews. This alignment will enable consideration of the most appropriate response in terms of the infrastructure provided:

- Realigning capital delivery timescales to housing development led timescales, particularly at a time when there is some expectation of an economic slowdown and corresponding impact on the housing market
- The availability of acceptable alternatives that may allow a deferral of investment in new places until developer contributions or basic need grant is available to avoid the borrowing costs of forward funding schemes.
- The typical profile of a new development is that numbers rise to a peak before subsequently falling and stabilising. Delivery options could look at more flexible ways in which to meet that peak.
- Consider more phasing of school expansions linked to actual development activity rather than planning for all known development in a community coming forward. There are some diseconomies associated with several smaller build projects, but it would help to link building with contributions and avoid some of the risk associated with some individual developments not coming forward or experiencing lengthy delay. Alternatively, if accommodation is to be future-proofed for future development that would need to be reflected in the s106 payments and triggers.
- The use of temporary accommodation more frequently where the basic need case is marginal or less compelling. However, it should be noted that the provision of new mobiles and associated site works have a capital cost and are funded through Council borrowing. If mobiles do have to be eventually replaced by permanent build it is not the most cost-effective approach.
- Prioritise the accommodation brief on the need for additional places. Improvements to existing buildings and deficiencies should be secondary subject to affordability limits established in the business plan and project budgets.

2.2 **Capital Costs and Benchmarking**

2.2.1 When this issue was previously considered by the CYP Committee in January 2021 it approved the use of the latest National Schools Delivery Cost Benchmarking Report (NSDCBR) to set a target cost per square metre for school buildings. Other measures were available, such as the DfE cost per pupil place measure, but not considered as reliable given the wide variations it highlighted. This is particularly the case when expanding existing schools, as the amount of space already available and its overall quality will have a

clear impact on the area of new accommodation required to facilitate an expansion by any given number of pupil places.

- 2.2.2 The NSDCBR target cost per sqm establishes value for money for the construction of school buildings, (both new builds and extensions) as a comparison is made against the updated nett average build rates from the range published in the latest NSDCBR. This updated average rate is then multiplied by the area of accommodation provided with reference to DfE area guidelines. This was used to contribute to budget setting within the Council's capital programme and the negotiation of developer contributions (s106 agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)) towards the cost of schools' infrastructure.
- 2.2.3 Traditionally tender price indices published by the Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) have been used to update these historical build cost rates £/m² to estimate the cost of future projects to outturn costs. This is the approach taken to establishing the budget allocated for future schemes in the capital programme
- 2.2.4 Following the rapid and significant increase in construction costs, it is felt that neither the rates contained within the latest NSDBR report (issued July 22), or the published BCIS all-in Tender price indices (all-in TPI) are representative of the current increased construction costs, the forecasting of future costs or provide a basis for reliable benchmarking between local authorities.
- 2.2.5 The NSDCBR study has previously been welcomed and supported by the Cabinet Office and the DfE. It is important as it publishes both local and central government education construction cost data in a coherent and standardised manner. The NSDCBR uses a common standard of cost analysis to capture cost data collated to a common price base, (currently 1Q22). The most recent collection of data was last autumn 2021 so the latest report has many caveats concerning the cost data returns. The returns have not yet picked up the full impact of Covid and material & labour shortages in the market. Also, the impacts of the events in the Ukraine are not yet evident in the data return and neither are the current significant increase being seen due to inflationary pressure. These will emerge as evidence in future data returns. The latest NSDCBR also contains more updated historical returns, approximately 90%, compared to new data received in the last collection period. This new data cost will be diluted by more historical data.
- 2.2.6 An exercise was carried out whereby other local authorities through regional groups and consultants have been contacted to find out if they are experiencing the current level of significant cost increase from early March 2022 (post commencement of the War in Ukraine) on education construction projects, to inform comparisons and how they have been dealing with it. In summary, all other local authorities and consultants contacted reported an increase in tendered costs compared to the previous cost estimates and project costs. Those projects that had been tendered required additional funding to be added to the project as the inflationary rises had far exceeded the uplifts forecast by BCIS indices and the additional risk allowances included in the cost plans to deal with inflation.
- 2.2.7 Very limited cost analyses were available for project tender sums received post early March 2022. At present, there were none available from BCIS online for Education projects for the whole of 2022. Concertus acting as consultant for a neighbouring County Council have stated that they experienced increased costs on some schemes being 30 to 40% more than

they would have seen 2-3 years ago. Faithful and Gould reported that as a company they had endeavoured to compare CCC project costs to other local authorities they provide consultancy services for. For one South Eastern Authority, there was between 26% to 57% increase on budgets for three small projects and for a Scottish authority 60%. Therefore, these cost increases appear are not unique to Cambridgeshire and the magnitude of these increases could not be foreseen. Also, that other authorities appear to have the same issues percentage wise.

2.2.8 The issues described around the reliability of current indices and the limited information derived from officers' own efforts to benchmark costs does mean that there is an evidence gap. In addition, it is likely to be some time (12 to 18 months) before the established indicators such as BCIS and NSCDBR provide a reliable benchmark for comparison purposes. It is, therefore, recommended that the Council use an established alternative procurement route outside of its own design and build contractor framework for a major school capital scheme so that it has its own comparison data that it can use to re-assure itself on the value for money question.

2.2.9 Meanwhile it is suggested that the Council re-affirm its intention to commit, once again, to the mid-point of the NSCDBR net build cost rate in 12 to 18 months-time when it is expected to represent a more reliable indicator of build costs.

2.2.10 In conclusion, in the absence of appropriate benchmarking we will seek to 'design to budget', working with our consultants and contractors, when approaching new schemes to mitigate the impact of rising costs. This will need to meet the basic need requirement and the DfE output specification (paragraph 2.3 more detail).

2.3 **School Buildings – Output Specification and NZEB**

2.3.1 The specification of a school building has a direct impact on the costs of construction and there are three main areas in the output specification to consider in this regard:

- The overall area or size and volume of spaces provided. These are set out in a Schedule of Accommodation (SOA)
- The performance and quality of materials provided; items such as windows, roofs, cladding
- The sustain ability of the building and its performance in terms of NZEB and carbon reduction.

2.3.2 The DfE guidance on these issues for primary and secondary schools is contained in its most recent Building Bulletin (BB)103. There is a separate bulletin (BB104) which applies to special schools. The County Council has its own more detailed guide (known as the "colour guides") covering the issues referred to above. A detailed comparison of the two specifications is attached as appendix 1.

2.3.3 **Schedule of Accommodation (SoA)**

For illustrative purposes, the comparison of the accommodation schedules has been undertaken based on providing a new build two form entry primary school with 26 early years places. The analysis is detailed and goes down to the level of individual rooms.

The total difference in the gross area provided is 286.94sqm. If the current EBDOG average gross cost per m2 is applied to this difference (£3,715) it equates to an estimated difference of £ 1,066,000 in build cost if the DfE BB103 areas are used. However, in March 2022 as part of its SEND sufficiency strategy this Committee approved the provision of additional SEND rooms in mainstream schools to both support mainstream schools but better manage the increasing demand for special school places or places in other types of specialist provision. It is assumed that this variation needs to remain within the SoA but will add an additional 120 sqm. This would reduce the difference in cost (calculated on the same basis) to £620,000.

2.3.4 Technical Specifications

There are some differences in the technical specification between the County specification and that issued by the DfE. However, the differences arise from a mix of practical experience, matters of policy and insurance requirements. They are highlighted in the relevant schedule again in appendix1.

The Council has moved to the more expensive 'Three Ply' system because of fabric failures found in the 'Single-Ply' system and the occurrence of leaks in new, and relatively new, buildings. It is recommended that the Council continues to use a 'Three Ply' roofing system, particularly as the requirement for more mechanical plant using the roof space increases, particularly in response to NZEB requirements, (photovoltaic panels, air-handling units etc.) the roofing material needs to be more robust.

The provision of sprinklers in new schools is a current County Council policy requirement. Typically, this adds between 2%-4% to the overall build costs of a school depending on whether the system is mains fed or external storage tanks are used. The DfE approach is to provide sprinklers in new schools only when specified through the outcome of a risk assessment. However, the bar is quite high, and they are not provided in most cases. It should be noted that the DfE has consulted on revised guidance for fire safety in schools and it is anticipated that when issued the major change will be to require the provision of fire sprinklers in new special schools.

There is a minor difference in terms of the specification for doors.

An indicative cost of these technical differences applied to a 2 FE primary school would be in the region of 1% of total build costs.

It is recommended that the Council will use the BB103 technical specification but that these differences or exceptions are noted.

2.3.5 Net Zero Carbon Schools

The Council developed its NZEB position for schools in response to the council's policies on the climate emergency. This standard was first designed as a pilot for the Alconbury Weald Schools and has since been rolled out to the design of other new schools that followed; Waterbeach Primary School and Sawtry Primary School.

The standard seeks an 80% reduction in regulated (e.g. electricity to the school etc.) and non-regulated (e.g. equipment that is 'plugged in') energy use in these schools.

- At least 6 BREEAM energy performance "Ene01" credits
- A EPC rating of A or better,
- Have on-site renewable energy generation installed, sized to meet a significant proportion (>80%) of the building's expected energy use (regulated and non-regulated).

The work enabled a 10% provision to be made across the capital programme for the additional costs associated with this standard.

The DfE approach to NZEB came somewhat later. The DfE specification was incorporated into the latest iteration of its DfE contractor framework launched late in 2021. The DfE added an additional 18% into its cost envelope for projects to be able to meet this standard. The difference reflects the enhanced specification now being followed by the DfE. While the Council's approach focussed on reducing energy use and on-site generation, the DfE approach also includes:

- Expectation of a plan for reducing carbon emissions to zero by 2050
- Future proofing the school against future climate range risks
- Biodiversity net gain
- Urban green cover target for sites
- Design/materials-based approach to achieving energy targets before the application of new technology
- Green roof systems mandatory

The adoption of BB103 would be expected by DfE and if free schools are proposed within the County, whether procured by DfE or the Council through the self-delivery mechanism, there would be an expectation that this specification would apply. It is assumed that there would be no wish to deliver schools procured by the Council through the presumption route to a lower NZEB standard.

Every effort will be made to meet these design requirements through the budgets to be approved in the 2023/24 business plan but recognising that this part of BB103 does represent a possible budget pressure.

2.4 **Routes to Market and Market Testing**

2.4.1 For construction purposes, the County Council has competitively procured its own design and build contractor framework. The most recent iteration of this framework dates from December 2021 and will run for 3 years with the option to extend by a further year.

2.4.2 The contractor frameworks have served the Council well over a period when there was a large pipeline of work arising from demographic change and major new housing developments. The Council was able to secure the resources necessary to deliver this large programme of work at a time when the construction sector was buoyant and at a cost that was within overall national benchmarking rates. However, there are some concerns

about the response of the framework in the current inflationary environment and period of future cost uncertainty. These include the approach taken to the pricing of risk and the variation in costs now coming through from contractors on schemes with a very similar scope of works. For these reasons, the time may be right to market test our current arrangement and consider the options for doing so. When approval was given by CYP Committee in November 2021 to re-procure the design and build contractor framework it was done so in the knowledge that it would not constrain the Council from using some of the alternative frameworks that had been included in the evaluation work. These were

- the DfE School Building Framework
- the Pagabo Framework
- the Scape Framework

There are many others now available (Crown Commercial Services (CCS) and the NHS framework) but which did not form part of the evaluation. The alternative market has grown in recent years presenting more options; including central government frameworks, industry frameworks and other local authority frameworks. A number of these are used alongside the DfE contractor framework to deliver school projects for example.

- 2.4.3 The design and build contractor framework in Cambridgeshire is supported by a consultant framework. The consultant framework provides a range of specialist services to support the delivery of the capital programme but most significantly design services, cost management and project management functions. This is to ensure that there is professional challenge and scrutiny of contractor proposals in terms of quality, statutory compliance, and value for money.
- 2.4.4 There are also a range of other professional services available via the consultant framework which have been accessed when required. For example, the framework was used to secure the expertise required to develop the Council's response to its energy reduction targets for new buildings in accordance with its adopted policies on the climate emergency.
- 2.4.5 The current iteration of the consultant framework was procured in 2019 and comes to an end on 31st July 2023. Ahead of any decision to re-procure its own framework, the Council has considered alternative arrangements including an in-house option and the use of other available frameworks offering very similar services. A market testing exercise has also been undertaken during October /November 2022 within the sector to assess the level of interest in a Cambridgeshire framework and the relative merits of the alternatives.
- 2.4.6 The exercise confirmed the established advantages of having our own framework;
- It will secure current rates in the marketplace via a competitive tender process
 - ability to shape the framework to match ongoing procurement needs and overarching goals such as NZEB targets, social value criteria etc making it more bespoke to Cambridgeshire. The current framework was used to develop our response to the Council's policy on the climate emergency.
 - Ability to offer in-house / off the shelf delivery solutions to wider parts of the Authority (e.g., New Shire Hall/Independent Living Suites)

- Ensure access is available to a 'one stop shop' for both Core and Support Services. Support Services include input into business case preparation, DfE grant funding applications such as the recent capital safety valve bid, curriculum analysis, cost benchmarking, NZEB/low carbon support etc.
- Access to programme level and not just project support to support the response to Covid, Ukraine, and Brexit.
- respond swiftly to urgent issues (e.g., Duxford Primary School fire)
- Standardisation of delivery and ability to then have an improved ability to monitor/compare the quality of services.
- Developing long term relationships with consultants and promotes investment in a local office and workforce. An understanding of the client organisation and the approach to local issues such as the planning process are then better understood.

2.4.7 However, the delivery of these local framework benefits does require a sufficient, visible pipeline of capital projects/works to attract sufficient interest from the market to obtain those competitive rates. Likewise, the development of relationships, local offices and an understanding of the wider Cambridgeshire context also require a certain throughput of work for this to occur. This future pipeline of work is much reduced looking at the 5-year capital programme and it is considered unlikely that this will change significantly given:

- The continued pressure on Council budgets and its ability to fund capital schemes through borrowing. This has already had an impact on the capital programme in the current 2023/24 business planning round
- Delivery timescales have required appointments to be made to several major capital projects in the last 12 months. Timescales will require further appointments to be made and we could utilise the current consultant framework to make these where necessary until 31st July 2023. The current 5-year programme would only require a further 8 appointments to be made with a capital construction value of £34m (total project value £42m)
- Demographic forecasts suggest that the birth rate has peaked and is now falling. There may be fewer projects required in existing communities in future years than in the past decade plus. The focus for new schools and places will be linked to those major housing developments in the County. However, there is the potential for a slow down in development linked to the overall economic situation that could extend the timescales in which new schools are required. The need to support a larger future capital programme appears to have receded.

2.4.8 For the Council, there will be a fixed level of officer resource required to manage and administer the framework over a reduced activity level.

2.4.9 Alongside these developments, in recent years the number of frameworks available (the market) offering professional services to public sector clients has increased. Whilst the use of an external framework will require a fee, they do offer an alternative procurement route that meet public sector procurement rules, flexibility over appointment method (mini-competition or direct award) and some choice for the Council in matching the framework and its field of consultants to the needs of the project. There would also be additional support to officers from the framework itself in dealing with any issues relating to performance.

- 2.4.10 It is, therefore, suggested that a decision to proceed to the tender stage for a new Cambridgeshire consultant work is deferred and reviewed again in 18 months -time. This will allow time for the Council to test alternative arrangements should appointments be required and consider a subsequent review of the business plan and any implications for the capital programme and the future pipeline of work.
- 2.4.11 The Council requires any re-procurement of services to consider an in-sourcing option. The viability of this option was tested using the Council's evaluation framework before a decision was made to explore the commissioning route. The main reasons for ruling out the in-sourcing option is that it would require the establishment of a multi-disciplinary "design office" and significant risks were identified with such an approach:
- The ability to recruit qualified property professionals in the current marketplace on the salaries payable in local government. There would then be a need to source expensive agency staff or have recourse to the market anyhow
 - Upfront financial investment in a new team and systems
 - The overheads of a design office would be carried by the Council when there is some uncertainty around the pipeline of capital projects. Future staff termination costs may occur
 - Up until 2007 (in addition to its in-house design team), CCC had its own Project Management/ Technical Design and Site Supervision team which delivered all Capital projects on behalf of the council. This was found not to deliver best value and flexibility for the Council and was gradually phased out and the department closed.
- 2.4.12 However, there are some concerns around the client team (Education Capital) outsourcing all professional services. In particular, an increased in-house capability to challenge costs, design and technical solutions may deliver some benefits and re-assurance to the Council on value for money, quality and performance relative to other local authorities. This is something officers will consider as part of the Team's structure.

3. Alignment with corporate priorities

3.1 Environment and Sustainability

The output specifications for school buildings developed by both the DfE and the County Council and detailed in section 2.3.5 of this report make significant commitments to reducing carbon and energy use on new buildings

3.2 Health and Care

The business plan focuses investment on those schemes that meet the basic need for more school places. If pupils have access to local schools and associated children's services, they are more likely to access them and are more likely to do so by walking or cycling. This will contribute to the development of both healthier and more independent lifestyles and contribute to the overall impact of the Council's policy to reduce carbon emissions in Cambridgeshire by 2050.

3.3 Places and Communities

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

3.4 Children and Young People

This corporate priority is explicit throughout the report as the business plan focuses investment on those schemes that meet the basic need for more school places.

This will ensure that children and young people will have access to educational provision that supports their learning and development in the communities in which they live. This is key to securing optimal outcomes for all children, as well as supporting their wellbeing and playing an important role in safeguarding them.

3.5 Transport

The 2023/24 business plan focusses investment on those schools where there is a need for additional school places. Measures put in place now to ensure delivery of this programme within the funding levels available will avoid a future increase in revenue costs to the Council for providing additional home to school transport and increased emissions due to resulting vehicle use.

4. Significant Implications

4.1 Resource Implications

The approach seeks to deliver the capital programme within the resources allocated in the 2023/24 business plan. However, there are considerable risks attached to this:

- the approach to budgeting and the use of the BCIS index for making provision for inflation within the business plan assumes a return to more normal market conditions following the inflationary spike this year arising from the disruption to supply chains due to a combination of Brexit, recovery from the Covid 19 pandemic and the war in Ukraine. The BCIS index has struggled to keep pace with the contract price increases experienced. For example, the index currently stands at around 10% but this does not reflect the increase in contract prices across the education sector
- there are future projects that are funded through historical S106 agreements and budgets that will not be supported by additional borrowing. These budgets are likely to come under pressure as:
 - The uplift in S106 funding is also linked to the BCIS index up to the point of payment and may be outpaced by inflation.
 - No allowance is included for NZEB in the agreements that pre-date this commitment. The Council did add 10% across school capital schemes to meet the costs of NZEB based upon the specification developed by the Council for school projects at Alconbury Weald, Sawtry and Waterbeach
- the economic forecasts for recession and a housing market slowdown will potentially impact upon the viability of development and the future level of section 106

contributions. Developers may also seek to renegotiate contributions already agreed for similar reasons. Fenland District Council has already introduced an interim policy on development viability which caps developer contributions at £2000 per dwelling. This figure would be insufficient to fund school infrastructure costs. There would also be other County and District service infrastructure requirements to fund.

- Developers and planners of major new housing sites retain high aspirations for the design of school buildings and, as public buildings, for them to be landmarks that contribute to the public realm. These requirements may not be compatible with the DfE output specification (with any Cambridgeshire variations) and add to the capital cost of schools
- The alternative procurement route is part of a testing process to enable a comparison with Cambridgeshire's present arrangements. It is not known at this stage whether they will out-perform or under-perform existing arrangements.
- The DfE net zero specification has added 18% to its cost model. The Council included 10% across the business plan to meet its locally developed standard seeking an 80% reduction in (regulated) energy use. No changes to budgets are suggested but there is likely to be a budget pressure arising from adoption of the DfE specification.

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

Whatever procurement approach or framework used to deliver the schemes within the capital programme officers will ensure that they have been procured in accordance with public sector procurement rules. The Council's own design and build contractor framework and its consultant framework are fully compliant.

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

Any organisation taking responsibility for procurement and delivery of a new building is accepting a range of development risks e.g., planning permission, bad weather, performance management of designers and contractors, health, and safety. These risks will sit with the County Council where it self-delivers, on behalf of the DfE, or delivers its own capital schemes.

Alternative procurement arrangements may be used for both procurement of consultants and contractors as part of a market testing approach set out in xx of the report. In this case most of these risks will remain with the employer (CCC) although support would be available from the framework owners to manager performance if difficulties do arise.

The LA has a statutory duty to provide sufficient places for all children requiring a school place. It is essential that there are sufficient school places to meet the needs of existing communities and new developments.

4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

The Council is committed to ensuring that children with special educational needs and/or disabilities (SEND) can attend their local mainstream school where possible, with only those

children with the most complex and challenging needs requiring places at specialist provision. The schools delivered through the business plan for 2023/24 will enable the Council to meet these requirements. New mainstream schools will also include the additional SEND rooms approved by CYP Committee in March 2022

4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

Extensive consultation on new school proposals is required as part of the place planning review and commissioning process. All major capital build proposals at new and existing schools are subject to pre-application planning consultation (by the applicant) and further consultation on the planning application itself. This is a statutory process undertaken by the planning authority.

4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

Local members would be fully involved in the consultation process set out in paragraph 4.5

4.7 Public Health Implications

It is Council policy that schools:

- should be sited as centrally as possible to the communities they serve, unless location is dictated by physical constraints and/or the opportunity to reduce land take by providing playing fields within the green belt or green corridors.
- should be sited so that the maximum journey distance for a young person is less than the statutory walking distances (3 miles for secondary school children, 2 miles for primary school children)
- should be located close to public transport links and be served by a good network of walking and cycling routes
- should be provided with Multi-use Games Areas (MUGAs) and all-weather pitches (AWPs) to encourage wider community use of school

There is also an expectation that schools will provide access to and use of the school's accommodation for activities (e.g., sporting, cultural) outside of school hours.

New schools will have an impact on the Public Health commissioned services such as school nursing, vision screening, National Childhood Measurement.

4.8 Environment and Climate Change Implications on Priority Areas

4.8.1 Implication 1: Energy efficient, low carbon buildings. Neutral Status

While new schools will be delivered in line with current planning policy around energy efficient and low carbon buildings, they will still result in increased energy demand. On balance, this is a neutral status.

The construction process, however, leads to increased embodied CO₂ emissions that are related with materials and the construction process of a building. This is including any CO₂ that is generated during the extraction of raw materials, the manufacturing and refinement of materials, transportation, installation, the practices applied, and disposal of which can all

produce high embodied carbon emissions which is unavoidable. The use of low embodied carbon materials always needs to be considered where practicable.

4.8.2 Implication 2: Low carbon transport.

Positive Status:

Schools on new developments are located to be accessible by walking and cycling, therefore, as this school is likely to be accessed by young people living on the development, most journeys are likely to be made without increasing carbon emissions. Where families express a preference to attend a school outside their catchment they are encouraged, where possible, to travel by sustainable means including public transport.

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

Neutral Status:

The planning applications for new schools include landscape designs and will be in line with planning policy to create some green space. Any trees removed and replanted as part of site clearance will be addressed through the planning application process and will be in line with current policy.

4.8.4 Implication 4: Waste Management and Tackling Plastic Pollution.

Negative Status:

The construction process will generate some unavoidable waste; however, this will be minimised as far as possible and robust waste management strategies implemented throughout the construction process. Waste generated by new schools will be subject to normal recycling facilities being provided on site. Other services operating from the school, e.g., early years provision by a third party, will adhere to policies on recycling.

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

Neutral Status:

The planning application for any new school will be submitted in line with planning policy. The statutory consultees include the Council's Floods team.

4.8.6 Implication 6: Air Pollution.

Neutral Status:

The planning application for any new school will be submitted in line with planning policy. Air pollution will be addressed as part of this process.

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

Positive Status:

Any new school proposal is designed to deliver education provision in the local community but will also facilitate community activities e.g., sport and other activities by community organisations through the school's letting policy. The services provided are not specific to climate change, however, local provision makes access easier, therefore if journeys are made by foot or by bike there will be reduced emissions as a result.

4.9 The status on the priority areas reflects current approaches and output specifications for school buildings. The CCC and DfE specifications for reducing the carbon impact of school buildings set out in section 2.3.5 of the report will alter the status in some areas moving forward.

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

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

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

Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your EqIA Super User?
No response
Name of Officer:

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

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

Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health?
Yes
Name of Officer: Helen Freeman

If a Key decision, have any Environment and Climate Change implications been cleared by the Climate Change Officer?
Yes
Name of Officer: Emily Bolton

5. Source documents

5.1 Source documents

Market Testing Survey Results
CCC proforma for Insourcing Services
CCC comparison of school building specification
CCC cost manager advice note on benchmarking

5.2 Location

New Shire Hall
Emery Crescent
Enterprise Way
Enterprise Campus
Alconbury Weald
Huntingdon
PE28 4EY

Contact ian.trafford@cambridgeshire.gov.uk