



## **PfS National Framework**

**Litherland High School  
One School Pathfinder**

**Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council**

## **Outline Business Case**

## Document Control

PfS and its advisers accept no liability whatsoever for any expense, liability, loss, claim or proceedings arising from reliance placed upon this **Template Document for the Outline Business Case**.

| Document Properties  |  |
|--|--|
| Document Owner   | Chris Dalziel / Keith Lovsey   |
| Organisation   | Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council                                  |
| Title  | PfS National Framework<br>Template Document<br>Outline Business Case |
| Abstract   |  |
| The OBC sets out the options appraisal, cost estimates, affordability assessment and procurement strategy for the rebuild of Litherland High School in sufficient detail to allow capital funding to be confirmed and gain approval to proceed with the delivery of the school via the PfS National Framework. |  |

| Version History |         |         |           |   |
|-----------------|---------|---------|-----------|---|
| Date            | Editor  | Version | Status    | Reason for change   |
| 05 Dec 07       | AR/KL   | 1.0     | Draft     | First issue of document   |
| January 08      | AR / KL | 2.0     | Draft     | Including Feasibility Report findings   |
| January 08      | AR /KL  | 3.0     | Draft     | Including Executive Summary findings  |
| 07 Feb 08       | AR/KL   | 4.0     | Draft     | Update for Client Specific data   |
| 20 Mar 08       | AR/KL   | 5.0     | Draft     | Updated financial information for Carbon Funding, Land title issues, final Client Specific data |
| 07/05/08        | KL      | 5.1     | Submitted | Updated Appendices. Reviewed cut and pasted summaries into Executive Summary                    |
| 11/06/08        | KL      | 6.0-8.0 | Revised   | Updated for feedback from PfS   |
| 26/06/08        | KL      | 9.0     | Final     | Updated for final feedback from PfS   |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>                  | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Introduction</b>                       | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Overview and Commitment</b>            | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Design and Construction</b>            | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Affordability</b>                      | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Readiness to Deliver</b>               | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>1 OVERVIEW AND COMMITMENT</b>          | <b>8</b>  |
| 1.1 The Corporate Vision                  | 8         |
| 1.2 Strategic Overview                    | 8         |
| 1.3 The Scheme                            | 8         |
| 1.4 LA Commitment                         | 8         |
| 1.5 Summary                               | 9         |
| <b>2 PROCUREMENT STRATEGY – NOT USED</b>  | <b>11</b> |
| <b>3 DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION</b>          | <b>11</b> |
| 3.1 Site Options Appraisal                | 11        |
| 3.2 Land                                  | 12        |
| 3.3 Surveys and Investigations            | 14        |
| 3.4 Design Brief                          | 17        |
| 3.5 Construction Phasing/Decant Strategy  | 17        |
| 3.6 Carbon Neutral & Renewable Energy     | 18        |
| 3.7 Third Party Agencies                  | 19        |
| 3.8 Summary                               | 21        |
| <b>4 ICT</b>                              | <b>23</b> |
| <b>5 FACILITIES MANAGEMENT – NOT USED</b> | <b>23</b> |
| <b>6 AFFORDABILITY</b>                    | <b>24</b> |
| 6.1 Design and Construction               | 24        |
| 6.2 Abnormal Costs                        | 25        |
| 6.3 ICT                                   | 25        |
| 6.4 Lifecycle/Hard FM costs – NOT USED    | 25        |
| 6.5 Other sources of funding              | 25        |
| 6.6 Summary                               | 26        |
| <b>7 READINESS TO DELIVER</b>             | <b>27</b> |
| 7.1 Project Management                    | 27        |
| 7.2 Consultation and Statutory Approvals  | 29        |
| 7.3 Market Testing                        | 29        |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>7.4 Risk</b>  | <b>30</b> |
| <b>7.5 Summary</b>   | <b>30</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 1 – OVERVIEW AND COMMITMENT</b>                | <b>31</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 2 – PROCUREMENT STRATEGY – NOT USED</b>        | <b>32</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 3 – BUILDING DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION</b>       | <b>33</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 4 – ICT</b>                                    | <b>34</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 5 - FACILITIES MANAGEMENT (NOT USED)</b>       | <b>35</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 6 - AFFORDABILITY</b>                          | <b>36</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 7 - READINESS TO DELIVER</b>                   | <b>37</b> |
| <b>RISK REGISTER EXTRACT</b>                               | <b>38</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 8 – LEADING AND MANAGING CHANGE (NOT USED)</b> | <b>40</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 9 - MOVING FORWARD – NOT USED</b>              | <b>41</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 10 - SURVEYS</b>                               | <b>43</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 11 – PROJECT TEAM SKILLS &amp; EXPERIENCE</b>  | <b>44</b> |
| <b>APPROVALS CHECKLIST</b>                                 | <b>47</b> |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Introduction

The document outlines the options appraisal, cost estimates, affordability assessment and procurement strategy for Litherland High School.

### Overview and Commitment

**Section 1** and **Appendix 1** of this OBC describe the Scheme and confirm the commitment of all parties to the procurement process.

The Local Authority has confirmed that the Scheme fits with its local priorities.

The Scheme involves Litherland High School

The Education Brief, the curriculum model and the accommodation schedule have been developed and signed off by the Project Board and by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF). The accommodation schedule details a total area that is within the BB98 gross area detailed in the Funding Allocation Model (FAM).

The LA and school confirm their commitment to procure the design and construction of the new school using the PfS National Framework and confirm that they will follow established PfS procedures and utilise the standard suite of documents for procurement. This includes the use of the National Framework Development Agreement and Design and Build Lump Sum Contract. The LA is satisfied with the terms and conditions within these documents.

### Design and Construction

**Section 3** and **Appendix 3** of this OBC describe the site options appraisal undertaken for the building design and construction.

The LA can confirm that they own the land upon which the School is to be built and that there are no encumbrances, restrictive covenants that would place the development and operation of the School at risk.

A robust and thorough options appraisal been carried out to determine the project proposals. The site options appraisals meet the requirements of Building Bulletin 98.

Surveys and investigations have been undertaken and the results evaluated. Collateral warranties will be in place for these surveys before issue of the ITT, with the objective that the Framework Panel Member can rely on their factual accuracy.

An initial control option for the Scheme has been prepared which demonstrates that the Scheme is deliverable. The Design Group and the Project Board have signed off the initial concept option as meeting the majority of the requirements of the Education brief and Design Brief. This concept option will be developed further in the next stages of the design process.

An Initial DQI Workshop has been held, and further work has been undertaken to agree and confirm the design weightings, and there is a commitment to using the DQI process throughout the design, construction and operation of the projects.

There is a commitment to achieving at a minimum BREAM 'very good' rating.

There is a commitment to achieving a minimum of 60% reduction in carbon emissions from the build.

The Design Brief has been developed. The Scheme will utilise the PfS Authority's Requirement document, amended to suit the local circumstances.

A construction phasing and decanting strategy has been developed.

All existing and proposed third party users have been identified and they will not be affected by the construction of the new school.

### **Affordability**

**Section 6** and **Appendix 6** of this OBC describes the affordability position for the whole Scheme.

The OBC provides a separate cost estimate reconciled against the FAM for both the design and build and ICT elements of the project.

The estimate indicates that there is a funding gap but also indicates how the LA intend to meet this gap.

This section of the OBC confirms the Council's view that the construction Scheme represents value for money.

The LA accepts that it has to deliver the project within the agreed funding envelope and will ensure that the scope of the development work fits within this envelope with due reference to the Framework rates. The LA will work with the Framework Panel Members to optimise the scope and will undertake any project scope changes necessary to ensure that the project fits within the funding envelope

The following additional sources of funding have been secured for the project:

- SMBC Capital Programme Up to: £2,304,000

### **Design and Construction**

Cost estimates for the initial design options for the Scheme have been produced. The cost estimate includes an assessment of likely abnormal costs taking into consideration the initial site investigations that have been carried out.

The funding allocated does not match the capital costs. The variance is explained and confirmation provided on how the funding gap will be met by the LA.

## Readiness to Deliver

**Section 7** and **Appendix 7** of the OBC sets out the LA's project management structure and identifies the roles and responsibilities of each part of the structure. The key members of the team and the external advisers are named and information is provided on their skills, experience and time commitment to the project. This section also sets out the approved budgets (including consultant advisory fees) and the authority to negotiate, delegated decision etc. to The Project Board.

The LA has followed the project structure and governance for National Framework Academy projects established by PfS, which includes the creation of a Project Steering Group, a Design Group and the LA Project Team.

The LA has put in place resources for the duration of the project, including post contract, to monitor and maintain ongoing relations with the Framework Panel Member and ensure that performance is continually reviewed.

A bidder day was held on 23<sup>rd</sup> January. 4 of the Framework Panel Members attended the event.

A risk workshop has been held and a risk strategy developed.

## **1 OVERVIEW AND COMMITMENT**

**Section 1** and **Appendix 1** describe the Scheme and confirm the commitment of all parties to the procurement process.

### **1.1 The Corporate Vision**

The LA is currently developing their corporate vision.

### **1.2 Strategic Overview**

The LA is currently developing their borough wide strategy.

### **1.3 The Scheme**

As part of the wider Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council has been awarded funding for a One School Pathfinder project to rebuild Litherland High School.

Litherland High School is an 11-16 co-educational specialist (Modern Foreign Languages), school with 839 pupils on roll. The rebuild of Litherland High School coincides with the closure of Bootle High School. Some of the pupils will transfer from Bootle High School to Litherland High School that will have a proposed capacity of 1200.

There are no additional facilities to be provided as part of the rebuild though it is intended that there will be future extended use of the facilities such as the Learning Resource Area and Sport's Hall, and the proposed layout has been planned to facilitate secure access with correct adjacencies.

It is intended that the rebuild of Litherland High School will commence in the second quarter 2009, with occupation of the new school in September 2010, and completion of the remaining Works by the end of the first quarter 2011.

The Education Brief, curriculum model and accommodation schedule, reflecting the organisation of the school, have been developed and signed off by the Design Group and Project Board. The accommodation schedule details a total area that is within the BB98 gross area detailed in the Funding Allocation Model (FAM).

Since the completion of the Education Brief, additional education consultancy has been secured to review the space needs in line with the way the school intends to deliver the curriculum, to deliver transformational education. Accommodation adjacencies have been developed and a bubble diagram produced showing the relative adjacencies and accommodation sizes. The revised accommodation schedule and bubble diagram are included in Appendix 1.

The design and construction works will be procured by the LA through the Partnerships for Schools (PfS) National Framework.

The associated end user ICT hardware and software will be procured by the LA through the Becta National Framework.

### **1.4 LA Commitment**

The LA confirms its commitment to procure the design and construction of the new school using the PfS National Framework.



The Project Board has been fully involved in the work to develop the OBC and confirms that the concept design supports the Education Brief that has been developed for Litherland High School.

The LA confirms that it will follow established PfS procedures and utilise the standard suite of documents for procurement. This includes the use of the National Framework Development Agreement and Design and Build Lump Sum Contract. The LA is satisfied with the terms and conditions within these documents.

The LA has signed the Memorandum of Understanding and Confidentiality Agreement. A copy of these documents is included in Appendix 1.

Confirmation of the closure of Bootle High School has been received - rebuild of LHS is not dependant on closure of BHS.

## 1.5 Summary

The Local Authority has confirmed that the Scheme fits with its local priorities.

The Scheme involves Litherland High School

The Education Brief, the curriculum model and the accommodation schedule have been developed and signed off by the Project Board and by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF). The accommodation schedule details a total area that is within the BB98 gross area detailed in the Funding Allocation Model (FAM).

The LA and school confirm their commitment to procure the design and construction of the new school using the PfS National Framework and confirm that they will follow established PfS procedures and utilise the standard suite of documents for procurement. This includes the use of the National Framework Development Agreement and Design and Build Lump Sum Contract. The LA is satisfied themselves with the terms and conditions within these documents.

The following documents are attached at **Appendix 1::**

- Education Brief, Curriculum Model and Accommodation Schedule that demonstrates an area within the BB98 allocation
- The bubble diagram showing area adjacencies required in the new school
- A letter of support from the LA
- A letter of support from the school
- Minutes of LA Cabinet meeting giving delegated authority to the Project Board for the OSP
- Papers and minutes of LA Cabinet meetings confirming support for the project

- Papers and minutes from Cabinet giving confirmation of additional capital funding
- Memorandum of Understanding
- Confidentiality Agreement
- Email from DCSF confirming the Funding provision and the formula for calculating the Carbon Reduction additional funding
- Confirmation of School Closure

## **2 PROCUREMENT STRATEGY – NOT USED**

## **3 DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION**

**Section 3** and **Appendix 3** of this OBC describe the site options appraisal undertaken for the design and construction works.

### **3.1 Site Options Appraisal**

In the development of the Design Brief, three main items of work were commissioned:

- Education Consultancy to develop the Vision for the School, the Education Brief, Curriculum Model and Accommodation Schedule to BB98.
- Technical Advisors to firstly undertake a feasibility study and subsequently to produce the Design Brief including consultation with the main stakeholders to develop a concept design for the new school, and then to produce cost estimates to check affordability against the Funding Allocation Model. The Design Brief is included in Appendix 3
- ICT Consultancy to liaise with the School and LA to develop an ICT Output Specification for the new build.

In addition to this, various surveys were commissioned to assist the design process, as detailed in section 3.3 below, and in readiness for engagement with the PfS Framework Panel Members. The Planning and Highway Departments of the Council were consulted to ensure that the proposals were in accordance with national and their local policies. Merseyside Environmental Advisory Unit was also contacted for local ecological advice and specific requirements.

The DQI process has been followed to evaluate design priorities for this project. An initial BREEAM assessment has been conducted to ascertain which criteria are fundamental to the project. The contractor must ensure that a minimum rating of “very good” is achieved from all the criteria.

A Client Design Advisor has also been appointed for the project to provide impartial advice to the Client and ensure the design process is progressing correctly.

As part of the feasibility study three concept designs were produced to block plan stage that were then evaluated to establish the best fit to the site restrictions, the strategic brief and DQI weightings. Following this further work to explore how the block areas in the concept design might be utilised for curriculum and community use needs has been completed. The output from this work is included at Section 2 of the Design Brief. An Executive Summary of the Feasibility Work was produced for the Council’s Project Board for sign-off of the concept design and for a recommendation to Council for the additional capital investment estimated as being required to deliver the new school. A copy of the Executive Summary is included in Appendix 3.

- The site is constrained in that the existing buildings are widespread and in order to ensure the school continues to operate on the same site, during construction, without full decant, the obvious location for the new school lies to the south-west corner of the site. This location is of benefit to the local community as it is furthest away from adjacent housing. It is also located away from the footpath running along the north of the site that attracts anti-

social behaviour. The ground investigation has not highlighted any particular areas of the site that should be avoided.

As part of the feasibility study the Council's Technical Advisors undertook consultation with the school, required adjacencies were recognised and incorporated within the block plans. Extended use of the school has been a feature of the design development, to enable public access via the reception and a secure route to the facilities. Phasing diagrams have been produced which address segregation between the contractor and school users throughout the build and access arrangements. The final plans highlight potential areas for future expansion.

The Design Group evaluated the concept design against the DQI weightings, cost, timeliness of delivery and match to the Strategic Brief. Summaries of the Architects and Design Team assessments are included in the Executive Summary, which can be found in Appendix 3.

### 3.2 Land

A plan of the site for the rebuild of Litherland High School has been agreed.

Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council has undertaken the title search, and is the owners of the land and has registered the land, Title No MS545590

There is no land disposal associated with this Scheme.

There is no land acquisition associated with this Scheme.

The LA can confirm ownership of the site, there are a number of conveyances and easements attached to the site as detailed in the table below.

| Issue    | Description   | Action to Mitigate  |
|----------|---|---|
| Covenant | The part of the property affected by the cables referred to at 2 below is subject to covenants prohibiting the Owner from interfering with the cables. The covenants are contained in a Deed of Grant dated 16 November 1982 made between the Metropolitan Borough Council of Sefton (1) The Merseyside and North Wales Electricity Board (2) ('the Deed of Grant') | The proposed location for the new school is removed from the cables. Ground works including on site roads and car parks are similarly away from the cable runs. |

|                    |  |  |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Other Encumbrances | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The part of the Property shown shaded blue on Plan 2 is subject to rights in favour of the Earl of Sefton to the passage of water and soil through the property from adjoining land of the Earl of Sefton. There is no information with the title as to the location of the land benefiting from the exercise of such rights. The rights are reserved by a Conveyance dated 10 April 1935.</li> <li>2. The property is subject to rights granted to the Merseyside and North Wales Electricity Board to lay cables in the approximate position indicated with a black line on Plan 2. The rights were created by the Deed of Grant.</li> <li>3. Part of the Property is subject to rights relating to the laying and maintenance of a sewer. The rights were reserved by a Conveyance dated 24 February 1950 but it is not possible to identify the route of the sewer although it is referred to as being shown by the red line on the plan annexed to the Conveyance the plan is not so marked.</li> <li>4. There is an existing licence for a mobile telecommunication mast erected on the roof of the Science Block. The licence expires in 2009 but the Council may be required to reissue the licence for a mast to be erected within the site.</li> </ol> |  |
|--------------------|--|--|

|                           |   |  |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| Notes on Charges Register | <p>1. The Deed of Grant of 1 May 1951 referred to at entry 5 to the Charges Register of title number MS545590 - this document does not relate to this site - (relates to Rowan Park).</p> <p>2. The Deed of Grant of 16 November 1982 referred to at entry 6 to the Charges Register of title number MS545590 - affects the land shown with a black line on Plan No 1 - see Part 1V, para. 2 of the Schedule to the Certificate.</p> <p>3. The land-tinted pink on the title plan to MS545590 is expressed to be subject to the covenant referred to at item 3 to the Charges Register. The covenant is not referred to in the Certificate as is personal to the original contracting party only (i.e. Netherton Land company Ltd).</p> | The Land Registry will be requested to remove this entry from the register |
|---------------------------|---|--|

### 3.3 Surveys and Investigations

The development of initial options has taken into account pre-existing Asset Management Plan (AMP) data, record drawings and previous surveys and investigations.

These records have been supplemented by the additional surveys listed in the table below and are included in Appendix 10. The surveys where so marked in the table below have collateral warranties that are capable of being novated to the Framework Panel Member.

| <b>Survey</b>  | <b>Date Completed</b> | <b>Findings</b>   | <b>Cost Implication (Yes/No)</b> | <b>Collateral Warranty Provided (Yes/No)<sup>1</sup></b> | <b>Location of Survey Report</b> |
|--|-----------------------|---|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Topographical survey   | April 07              | See Survey Report   |                                  | Warranty to be provided                                  | CD Rom as Appendix 10 to the OBC |
| Underground utilities investigation                                      | April 07              | See Survey Report   |                                  | Warranty to be provided                                  | As above                         |
| Type 3 Asbestos Surveys  | April 07              | See Survey Report   |                                  | Warranty to be provided                                  | As above                         |
| Fully dimensioned measured building surveys - floor plans                | SMBC                  |   |                                  | History of drawings supplied                             | As above                         |
| Desk top ground investigation and intrusive investigation scoping        | April 07              | See Survey Report   |                                  | Warranty to be provided                                  | As above                         |
| Intrusive ground investigation including factual and interpretive report | April 07              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No site-wide contamination. Hotspot of Arsenic in probe hole Ws4 within topsoil.</li> <li>• Minimal risk to Ground water. Risk to controlled waters considered low.</li> <li>• Risk from landfill gas considered low – David H. Jones</li> <li>• Contaminated Land Team Leader recommends no further monitoring is required,</li> <li>• Low risk to Plant life.</li> </ul> |                                  | Warranty to be provided                                  | As above                         |
| Previous land use desk top study   | April 07              |   |                                  |  | As above                         |

<sup>1</sup> Where Warranty to be provided is stated, the Council's Legal Team is working with the suppliers of the survey to put in place a warranty that can be relied upon by the PfS Framework Members. These warranties will be in place prior to the issue of the ITT 24<sup>th</sup> July 2008

| <b>Survey</b>                    | <b>Date Completed</b> | <b>Findings</b>  | <b>Cost Implication (Yes/No)</b> | <b>Collateral Warranty Provided (Yes/No)<sup>1</sup></b> | <b>Location of Survey Report</b> |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Site noise survey and assessment | Not Completed         |  |                                  |  | As above                         |
| Statutory Utilities searches     | April 07 SMBC         | See Report   |                                  | Warranty to be provided                                  | As above                         |
| Phase 1 Ecology Habitat Survey   | Not Completed         | To be carried out during bird breeding/ nesting season Summer 08 |                                  |  | As above                         |
| Visual Structural Inspection     | SMBC                  | See Condition Report   |                                  |  | As above                         |
| Flood Risk Assessment            | May 07 SMBC           | See Report   |                                  |  | As above                         |
| Traffic Impact Assessment        | March 08              | See Report   |                                  |  | As above                         |



### 3.4 Design Brief

The Design Brief has been developed and it reflects the Project Board and Design User Group's aspirations expressed during the development of the initial options, design presentations and evaluation. The Design Brief contained within the OBC contains a summary identifying the design developments to date. This will be included within the Invitation to Tender (ITT) documents at the procurement stage, which will also include the Education Brief. The Design Brief is attached at Appendix 3.

In developing the Scheme, the Council will utilise the PfS Authority's Requirements, amended to suit the local circumstances.

#### ***Design Quality***

Three distinct measures of design quality must be used in the One School Pathfinder / BSF development processes. These will be linked to the Key Performance Indicator (KPI) and benchmarking data:

- ***The Design Quality Indicator (DQI)***

The initial part of the process is the 'FAVE' evaluation. A workshop was held with key stakeholders, in May, led by Andy Thompson an accredited DQI facilitator. An additional session was held with Broadway Malyan during the Feasibility period to agree the design quality weightings for the school.

The School and LA are committed to the use of the DQI process throughout the design, build and operation of the project.

- ***BREEAM for Schools***

The requirement for a minimum 'very good' aspiring to Excellent BREEAM (Building Research Establishment's Environmental Assessment Method) score will be encapsulated within the procurement documentation upon which bidders designs will be benchmarked. It will be a requirement for bidders to demonstrate during their design development that the required score can be met within the funding allowance.

The initial BREEAM assessment has been completed by the Council's BREEAM accredited Architect and is enclosed at Appendix 3.

- ***Carbon Calculator***

The Council require that the new school is built to meet a minimum 60% reduction in the carbon emissions released from A Building Regulations 'notional building' (i.e. a school constructed to 2002 Building Regulations).

The baseline corresponds to 35.94 kgCO<sub>2</sub>/m<sup>2</sup> derived from schools built to the 2002 Regulations and will mean the carbon emissions associated with the operation of the new school must not exceed 15.13 kgCO<sub>2</sub>/m<sup>2</sup> and should ideally be significantly less.

### 3.5 Construction Phasing/Decant Strategy

The construction phasing and decanting strategy has been developed to a reasonable level of detail. In considering the options for transition, the effects on pupils and staff of the construction work and decanting have been taken into full

account, with the aim of balancing the need to minimise both the cost of the decanting and the extent of the disturbance and disruption.

The construction phasing of the Preferred Option, is detailed below: (Also refer to Appendix 3)

|  |                        |
|--|------------------------|
| • Supply & Set up of Temporary Accommodation | April 2009             |
| • Mobilisation                               | April 2009             |
| • Strip out South Block                      | May 2009               |
| • Demolition of South Block                  | June 2009              |
| • Construction of new school                 | July 2009 to July 2010 |
| • Commission, Fit Out and Occupy             | August 2010            |
| • School Operational                         | September 2010         |
| • Remove Temporary Accommodation             | September 2010         |
| • Demolish Remainder of Buildings            | Sept 2010 to Dec. 2010 |
| • Landscaping                                | Q1 2011                |

The phasing plans set out in detail in the Feasibility Study report show the demolition of the existing and construction of the new school and grounds over four phases:

- Phase 1: Contractor compound set-up and access routes established. Installation of the temporary accommodation, decant and demolition of the southern block.
- Phase 2: Construction of new school
- Phase 3: Occupation of new school and removal of temporary accommodation. Demolition of remaining buildings
- Phase 4: Landscaping, access and car parking. Removal of contractor compound.

The construction involves partial demolition of the existing school, with some decant into temporary accommodation on-site. The extent of temporary accommodation required has been calculated to ensure curriculum delivery throughout the construction period for the entire school without decant off-site, which is economically advantageous and negates school management problems associated with split sites. The location of the new build and construction compound is organised to enable complete segregation between the construction site and school users throughout the build process to minimise disturbance, disruption and health and safety risks.

It is the Council's intention that the specification, procurement, build and commissioning of the temporary accommodation and following completion of the school buildings the decommissioning, removal and making good works will be completed by the Framework Contractor.

### **3.6 Carbon Neutral & Renewable Energy**

As part of the governments commitment to deliver carbon neutral schools the DCSF issued a letter, on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2007, relating to additional funding if carbon emissions can be reduced from new school buildings by 60%, relative to those now being built and that have been designed to 2002 Building Regulations. The target also includes emissions attributable to equipment used within the school.

Additional funding of £57<sup>2</sup> per square metre of floor area will be provided for the Sefton MBC One School Pathfinder project to help meet this target. This funding would equate to an additional £563,730.

Revisions to Part L Building Regulations during 2006 require that some of this reduction is already being achieved, and further carbon savings will be achieved where there are planning requirements for renewable energy or to achieve BREEAM ratings.

Sefton Council require that a minimum of 10% of energy supplied to the school will be from renewable resources.

It is our intention that as part of the work to be completed by the RIBA C Framework Contractors they will complete an assessment of future energy usage and the cost effectiveness of supplying >10% renewable energy.

### **3.7 Third Party Agencies**

The table below details all the current and proposed third party users on the site and identifies where they will be located once the building works have been completed. The phasing of the build will not affect the third party users listed below, as the Sports Hall will be demolished after the construction of the new school that will include a new Sport's Hall. The users book the facilities for one session per week, which equates to one hour, except for Eden Vale who use the hall for two sessions per week. Bookings are made via the Finance section at the school between 8am and 4pm, and bookings are made for a minimum of a 10-week term. On arriving at the school, the users are met by the caretaker who explains the health and safety procedures and checks everything is satisfactory and then the users sign in. The caretaker prepares and ensures the equipment provided is as required, then after the sessions the users sign out and leave the premises. The Third Party Users will be contacted during the consultation period to ensure they are aware of the proposed rebuild and its affect on their use of the facilities.

---

<sup>2</sup> £50m<sup>2</sup> calculated at Q1 2007 prices adjusted for construction start date Q1 2009

|                                 | Current Users |              |   | Users once Building Works Completed |              |                      |   |
|---------------------------------|---------------|--------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|---|
| Third Party                     | No. of Staff  | CRB Checked? | Accommodation                               | No. of Staff                        | CRB Checked? | Entrance Requirement | Accommodation                               |
|                                 | (FT/PT)       | (Yes/No)     | (Location, no. of rooms, area of each room) | (FT/PT)                             | (Yes/No)     |                      | (Location, no. of rooms, area of each room) |
| Girobank FC - Mr J Connolly     | 1 - FT        | No           | Sport's Hall                                | 1 - FT                              | No           | Via Admin/ Reception | Sport's Hall                                |
| Mr R Range                      | 1 - FT        | No           | Sport's Hall                                | 1 - FT                              | No           | Via Admin/ Reception | Sport's Hall                                |
| Belfry - Mr Hunt                | 1 - FT        | No           | Sport's Hall                                | 1 - FT                              | No           | Via Admin/ Reception | Sport's Hall                                |
| Stand Park FC - Mr Holmes       | 1 - FT        | No           | Sport's Hall                                | 1 - FT                              | No           | Via Admin/ Reception | Sport's Hall                                |
| Seaforth Cornmills - Mr Foy     | 1 - FT        | No           | Sport's Hall                                | 1 - FT                              | No           | Via Admin/ Reception | Sport's Hall                                |
| Nethy Villa FC - Mr I Forrester | 1 - FT        | No           | Sport's Hall                                | 1 - FT                              | No           | Via Admin/ Reception | Sport's Hall                                |
| Edenvale JFC - Mrs Rimmer       | 1 - FT        | No           | Sport's Hall                                | 1 - FT                              | No           | Via Admin/ Reception | Sport's Hall                                |
| Billingtons FC - Mr Langton     | 1 - FT        | No           | Sport's Hall                                | 1 - FT                              | No           | Via Admin/ Reception | Sport's Hall                                |
| U16 Disabled - Mr S Johnson     | 1 - FT        | No           | Sport's Hall                                | 1 - FT                              | No           | Via Admin/ Reception | Sport's Hall                                |
| Crosby Stuart - Mr P Hudson     | 1 - FT        | No           | Sport's Hall                                | 1 - FT                              | No           | Via Admin/ Reception | Sport's Hall                                |
| Lion & Unicorn - Mr D Jones     | 1 - FT        | No           | Sport's Hall                                | 1 - FT                              | No           | Via Admin/ Reception | Sport's Hall                                |

### 3.8 Summary

The LA can confirm that they own the land upon which the School will be built and that there are no encumbrances, restrictive covenants that would place the development and operation of the School at risk.

A robust and thorough options appraisal been carried out to determine the project proposals. The site options appraisals meet the requirements of Building Bulletin 98.

Surveys and investigations have been undertaken and the results evaluated. Collateral warranties will be in place for these surveys before issue of the ITT, with the objective that the Framework Panel Member can rely on their factual accuracy.

An initial control option for the Scheme has been prepared which demonstrates that the Scheme is deliverable. This initial control option has been signed off by the Design Group and the Project Board as meeting the majority of the requirements of the Education brief and Design Brief and will be developed further in the next stages of the design process.

An Initial DQI Workshop has been held, and further work has been undertaken to agree and confirm the design weightings, and there is a commitment to using the DQI process throughout the design, construction and operation of the projects.

There is a commitment to achieving at a minimum BREAM 'very good' rating.

There is a commitment to achieving a minimum of 60% reduction in carbon emissions from the build.

The Design Brief has been developed. The Scheme will utilise the PfS Authority's Requirement document, amended to suit the local circumstances.

A construction phasing and decanting strategy has been developed.

All existing and proposed third party users have been identified and they will not be affected by the construction of the new school.

The following documents are attached at **Appendix 3**

- Plan of the site
- Certificate of Land Title
- Warranty for Land Title search
- Site options appraisals – Feasibility Report & Executive Summary
- Collateral Warranties for surveys and investigations
- Output from DQI Workshop
- Output from initial BREEAM Assessment

- Design Brief
- Construction Phasing/Decant Strategy
- First assessment Carbon Calculator

**4 ICT**

The Council has reviewed the ICT services for the new school and produced the ICT Output Specification that is reproduced at Appendix 4. Further work to develop the Functional and Technical Specifications is planned to coincide with the RIBA Stage C work with procurement of the ICT Services via the BECTA Framework scheduled to take place in parallel with the first phase construction of the school.

**5 FACILITIES MANAGEMENT – NOT USED**

## 6 AFFORDABILITY

**Section 6** and **Appendix 6** of this OBC describes the affordability position for the whole Scheme.

### 6.1 Design and Construction

The FAM for the Litherland High School scheme is shown in the table below together with the cost estimate for the scheme completed as part of the Feasibility Report. PfS Framework construction and fee rates have not been used in the Council's estimate as these are not available until after the Council selects the two Framework Members with whom it will work on the design specification for the new school. The Council has referred to both market & FAM rates to estimate the construction costs and fees.

As part of its feasibility study the Council produced estimates of costs this suggested that for the total costs for design & build of the new school including internal resource costs would be higher if procurement was through OJEU than if the project were procured through the PfS Framework.

In preparation for tendering through the PfS Design & Build Framework, the Council has used PfS FAM rates to estimate the cost of the new school. The cost estimate, including a £735,000 provision for internal project support is £2,303,967 more than the total funds to be received from DCSF. The Council is committed to the One School Pathfinder and has therefore made provision within its Capital Programme to meet this funding shortfall.

Assessing the estimated costs for the design and build of the preferred concept design using the PfS Framework has been completed and is summarised in Table 1 below. There is a gap between the anticipated funds from DCSF and the estimated cost of procurement through the PfS Framework. This gap is £ 2,303,967 and will be met from the Capital Programme provision made by the Council. Notwithstanding the funding gap, the Project Board at its meetings of 25<sup>th</sup> March and 11<sup>th</sup> June considered the costs against the potential deliverables (the new school presented as different concept designs) and determined that the preferred concept design procured through the PfS D & B Framework was likely to represent the best value for money that could be achieved.

**Table 1**

| Preferred Option                  | FAM               | LA Estimate       | Variance         |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Base Construction Costs           | 15,582,684        | 15,582,684        | 0                |
| Site Costs                        | 1,869,922         | 1,869,922         | 0                |
| Abnormals                         | 779,134           | 1,439,467         | 660,333          |
| Cost for Carbon Reduction         | 563,730           | 564,225           | 495              |
| Fees                              | 2,349,434         | 2,432,037         | 81,243           |
| Internal Project Team Fees        | 0                 | 734,587           | 734,587          |
| FFE                               | 1,350,000         | 1,350,000         | 0                |
| ICT Infrastructure                | 270,000           | 270,000           | 0                |
| <b>D&amp;B Contract sub-total</b> | <b>22,764,904</b> | <b>24,242,922</b> | <b>1,478,018</b> |
| ICT Hardware                      | 1,740,000         | 1,740,000         | 0                |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>24,504,904</b> | <b>25,982,922</b> | <b>1,478,018</b> |
| <b>Funding</b>                    |                   |                   |                  |
| DCSF Funding Allowance 2006       | 22,365,225        | 22,365,225        | 0                |
| Inflation Adjustment 2007         | 750,000           | 750,000           | 0                |



|                                |                   |                   |                          |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Carbon Reduction Funding       | 563,730           | 563,730           | 0                        |
| SMBC Capital Programme Funding |                   | 2,303,967         | 1,478,018 +<br>825,949 . |
| <b>Total Funding</b>           | <b>23,678,955</b> | <b>25,982,922</b> | <b>2,303,967</b>         |
| Funding Shortfall              | 825,949           | 0                 |                          |

As stated above the cost estimate makes allowance for the sum of approximately £245k each year for Project Support Funding. This sum totalling £734,587 will meet the costs of the internal project team and will ensure adequate funds are available to meet the cost of the in-house project team, additional independent expert assistance including CDA services and Project Management.

The ICT Hardware provision of £1,740,000 is the subject of a separate procurement through Becta, this sum will not be available for the Framework Members D & B contract.

## 6.2 Abnormal Costs

During the development of the initial designs, the LA has undertaken surveys and investigations and considered the results. The estimated costs of abnormalities have been identified, and market testing has been carried out for Demolition, Asbestos Removal and Temporary Accommodation. The abnormal costs are summarised in Table 2 below:

**Table 2**

| <b>Abnormal</b>               | <b>LA Estimate</b> |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| Demolitions and Alterations   | 250,000            |
| Asbestos Removal              | 40,000             |
| Temporary Accommodation       | 403,907            |
| Ground Conditions             | 150,000            |
| Alterations to entrance roads | 50,000             |
| Sprinkler System              | 295,560            |
| Substation                    | 100,000            |
| Utilities                     | 100,000            |
| Phasing                       | 50,000             |
| Sub Total                     | 1,439,467          |
| Sustainability                | 564,225            |
| <b>Total</b>                  | <b>2,003,692</b>   |

## 6.3 ICT

Of the capital funding provided for the new school, £1,740,000 is for ICT and subject to a separate procurement through the Becta Framework; £270,000 of the total sum is ring fenced for the provision of ICT infrastructure, in accordance with the Funding Allocation Model.

## 6.4 Lifecycle/Hard FM costs – NOT USED

## 6.5 Other sources of funding

The Cabinet has approved a recommendation from Project Board that the estimated shortfall in DCSF funding for the project is be provided from the Capital Programme 2008-2011. This estimate of £2,304,000 includes a provision of £775,000 to meet internal project support funding.

## 6.6 Summary

The OBC provides a separate cost estimate reconciled against the FAM for both the design and build and ICT elements of the project.

The estimate indicates that there is a funding gap but also indicates how the LA intend to meet this gap.

This section of the OBC confirms the Council's view that the construction Scheme represents value for money.

The LA accepts that it has to deliver the project within the agreed funding envelope and will ensure that the scope of the development work fits within this envelope with due reference to the Framework rates. The LA will work with the Framework Panel Members to optimise the scope and will undertake any project scoping changes necessary to ensure that the project fits within the funding envelope

The following additional sources of funding have been secured for the project:

- SMBC Capital Programme Up to : £2,304,000

### ***Design and Construction***

The estimated costs for the initial design options for the Scheme have been completed. The cost estimate includes an assessment of likely abnormal costs that consider the initial site investigations that have been carried out.

The funding allocated does not match the capital costs. The variance has been explained and confirmation provided on how the funding gap will be met by the LA.

The following documents are attached at **Appendix 6**:

- PfS Funding Allocation Model
- LA Cost Estimate
- Schedule of Abnormal Costs
- Copies of formal member reports covering the assessment of affordability, together with resolutions approving the budget strategy
- A letter from the LA confirming their commitment to investment in ICT.

## 7 READINESS TO DELIVER

**Section 7 and Appendix 7** of the OBC sets out the LA's project management structure and identifies the roles and responsibilities of each part of the structure. The key members of the team and the external advisers are named and information is provided on their skills, experience and time commitment to the project. This section also sets out the approved budgets (including consultant advisory fees) and the authority to negotiate, delegated decision etc. to the Project Board.

### 7.1 Project Management

The LA has established and maintained a fully resourced project management regime for the successful delivery of Scheme.

| Role on Project       | Position   | Name  | Time Commitment (days/month) |
|-----------------------|--|---|------------------------------|
| Owner                 | Strategic Director - Children's Services                                       | Bryn Marsh  | 2 days a month               |
| Project Director      | Project Director OSP & 6 <sup>th</sup> Form College                            | Paul Williams   | Full time <sup>3</sup>       |
| Client Manager        | School Organisation and Capital Programme Manager                              | Chris Dalziel   | 1 day a week                 |
| Project Management    | Mouchel Plc  | Alison Roberts  | 3 days week                  |
| Consultancy Support   | Mouchel Plc  | Keith Lovsey  | ½ day a week                 |
| Technical Advisors    | SMBC Technical Services Team supplemented as necessary by support from Mouchel | Various technicians & professionals including Architects, Engineers, Surveyors, and supporting staff. | 2 days a week                |
| LA Design Champion    | Architectural Projects Group Manager   | Liz Gatheral  | 1 day a week                 |
| Client Design Advisor | 2020Liverpool Consultancy Services   | Graham Winckles   | 2 days month                 |
| ICT Advisors          | E-Services Manager. and his Team   | Wayne Leatherborrow   |                              |
| Legal Advisor         | Legal Director & her team  | Caroline Elwood   | 2 days a month               |
| LA 14-19 Advisor      | Ass't Director - Schools   | Alan Potter   | 2 days a month               |

<sup>3</sup> Paul Williams previously Technical Services Director with SMBC has been contracted to the position of project director for the duration of the LHS OSP Project.



## assessment

In addition, PfS has provided support during the project development, and has monitored progress check whether the requirements of the new Framework have been met. The PfS Project Director is Simon Brown.

The budget for the procurement and delivery phases of the budget has been approved and authority has been delegated to the Project Board.

The LA will use the agreed project funding to pay for the design and construction of the Litherland High School including the professional, managerial and administrative resources to deliver the project, and the LA confirms that it will meet the costs of any overspend above the DCSF funding provision of £23,678,955.

## 7.2 Consultation and Statutory Approvals

The following consultation has taken place in relation to the Scheme:

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| Planning      | <p>The Design Team has liaised with the Planning Authority. The following key planning concerns have been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Layout – façade to face Sterrix Lane</li> <li>• Car Parking – Disabled – Motorbike - Cycle Spaces</li> <li>• Access</li> <li>• Tree Planting</li> <li>• Consultation</li> </ul> <p>The following has been obtained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter of Comfort – confirming that planning have been consulted on the proposals and there are no material objections</li> </ul> |
| Sport England | The team has contacted Sport England about the proposals and an email of support has been received.   |
| Section 77    | There is no requirement for land disposal as part of the scheme   |

As part of the design process a Communication and Consultation Plan has been developed and is included in Appendix 7. It is intended to hold two public consultations on the proposals, one at Outline Planning Application Stage, in April 08, and one later in the year once the detailed design has been produced. Updates on the design development will be regularly posted on the Sefton Council website for public information. Communication will be carried out in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

## 7.3 Market Testing

The LA has contacted the Framework Panel Members and a bidder day was held on 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2008. Four of the Framework Panel Members attended the event: Wilmott Dixon, Kier, Laing O Rourke and Carillion.

A record of the questions raised and answers provided during the Bidders Day is included in Appendix 7

As part of the procurement a further Bidders Day is scheduled for 4<sup>th</sup> July following

issue of the PITT

## 7.4 Risk

A risk workshop has been held and a risk strategy developed. This risk register is reviewed on a regular basis.

The Risk Register details:

- The risks identified
- Who is responsible for the mitigation
- Measures being taken to mitigate each risk

## 7.5 Summary

The LA has followed the project structure and governance for National Framework Academy projects established by PfS, which includes the creation of a Project Steering Group, a Design Group and the LA Project Team.

The LA has put in place resources for the duration of the project, including post contract, to monitor and maintain ongoing relations with the Framework Panel Member and ensure that performance is continually reviewed.

A bidder day was held on 23<sup>rd</sup> January. The event was attended by 4 of the Framework Panel Members.

A risk workshop has been held and a risk strategy developed.

The following documents are attached at **Appendix 7**:

- Budget for procurement and delivery
- Letter of comfort from the Planning Authority
- Questions and Answers from Bidder's Day
- Letter from Sport England
- Communication and Consultation Plan
- Risk Register (detailing top 15 risks)
- Project Board Terms of Reference

## **APPENDIX 1 – OVERVIEW AND COMMITMENT**

- Education Brief, including the Curriculum Model and Accommodation Schedule that demonstrates an area within the BB98 allocation
- The Bubble Diagram showing area adjacencies in the new school
- A letter of support from the School
- A letter of support from the LA
- Minutes of LA Cabinet meeting giving delegated authority to the Project Board for the OSP
- Papers and minutes of LA Cabinet meetings confirming support for the project
- Papers and minutes from Cabinet confirming Additional Capital Funding
- Email from DCSF confirming the Funding provision and the formula for calculating the Carbon Reduction additional funding.
- Confirmation of School Closure
- Memorandum of Understanding
- Confidentiality Agreement

## **APPENDIX 2 – PROCUREMENT STRATEGY – NOT USED**



### **APPENDIX 3 – BUILDING DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION**

- Plan of the site
- Certificate of Land Title
- Warranty for Land Title search
- Site options appraisals Feasibility Report & Executive Summary
- Collateral Warranties for surveys and investigations
- Output from DQI Workshop
- Initial BREEAM Assessment
- Design Brief
- Construction Phasing/Decant Strategy
- First assessment Carbon Calculator

## **APPENDIX 4 – ICT**

- ICT Output Specification
- ICT Letter between the Council & School for ICT Support

## **APPENDIX 5 - FACILITIES MANAGEMENT (NOT USED)**

## **APPENDIX 6 - AFFORDABILITY**

- PfS Funding Allocation Model
- LA Cost Estimate
- Schedule of Abnormal Costs
- Copies of formal member reports covering the assessment of affordability, together with resolutions approving the budget strategy and A letter from the Section 151 Officer confirming the affordability of the Scheme
- A letter from the Council confirming its commitment to investment in ICT.

## **APPENDIX 7 - READINESS TO DELIVER**

- Budget for procurement and delivery
- Letter of comfort from the Planning Authority
- Email from Sport England
- Communications & Consultation Plan
- Extract form Risk Register (detailing top 15 risks)
- Project Board Terms of Reference & associated Cabinet Minute

**RISK REGISTER EXTRACT**

| Ref | Risk                                       | Assessment of Risk            |               |        |  | Assessment of Residual Risk |               |          |
|-----|--|-------------------------------|---------------|--------|--|-----------------------------|---------------|----------|
| No  |  | (Assume no controls in place) |               |        |  | (Control measures in place) |               |          |
|     |  | Impact                        | Likelihood    | Risk   | Risk Control Measures  | Impact                      | Likelihood    | Residual |
|     |  | (Severity)                    | (Probability) | Rating |  | (Severity)                  | (Probability) | Risk     |
| 29  | Building Quality                           | 4                             | 4             | 16     | Processes - DQI - CDA. Construction Project Manager.   | 2                           | 3             | 6        |
| 5   | Staff Capacity within Council              | 4                             | 4             | 16     | Greater reliance on external resources. Charge SMBC staff to project then refund council staff fees. Develop Resource Plan for Council Staff Persuade Council high priority project. Appointment of external PM confirmed. Appointment of Paul Williams as dedicated Project Director confirmed. | 3                           | 1             | 3        |
| 12  | Disruption to the School                   | 4                             | 4             | 16     | Planning and liaison - prior notification to the school. Change school hours. Employ contractors with "Considerate Constructor" status.  | 1                           | 2             | 2        |
| 13  | Planning Issues                            | 4                             | 4             | 16     | Outline Planning Application in line with RIBA B - Preferred Design. Early consultation with Planning Dept. & key stakeholders.  | 1                           | 1             | 1        |
| 27  | Negative impact on BSF Programme & Funding | 4                             | 4             | 16     | Removed if risk mitigation successful  | 1                           | 1             | 1        |
| 21  | Bootle High School Closure                 | 3                             | 4             | 12     | Appoint person to manage transfer of pupils from BHS. BHS/ LHS involve in design development. Create staffing federation with 2 governing bodies. Develop protocols for closure - plans.   | 2                           | 4             | 8        |

| Ref | Risk   | Assessment of Risk            |               |        |   | Assessment of Residual Risk |               |          |
|-----|--|-------------------------------|---------------|--------|---|-----------------------------|---------------|----------|
| No  |  | (Assume no controls in place) |               |        |   | (Control measures in place) |               |          |
|     |  | Impact                        | Likelihood    | Risk   | Risk Control Measures   | Impact                      | Likelihood    | Residual |
|     |  | (Severity)                    | (Probability) | Rating |   | (Severity)                  | (Probability) | Risk     |
| 22  | Constrained Site/ Phasing  | 3                             | 4             | 12     | Design/ Planning  | 2                           | 4             | 8        |
| 1   | Delay to the school opening - staff management changes           | 4                             | 3             | 12     | Shadow appointments to be explored. Possible delayed retirement. Set project priorities to delivery date.   | 2                           | 2             | 4        |
| 3   | Adequacy of DCFS Funding provision & control of costs escalation | 3                             | 4             | 12     | PfS Framework provides only a nominal breakdown of fees - Ensure all fees are estimated including specialists. QS to check affordability throughout the project. Council has provided additional Capital to meet estimated affordability gap. | 2                           | 2             | 4        |
| 11  | H&S during Construction  | 4                             | 3             | 12     | Appointment of CDM coordinator  | 2                           | 2             | 4        |
| 24  | Project Control Processes  | 3                             | 4             | 12     | Management Resource - Project Board - Project Structures to be maintained through project life.   | 2                           | 2             | 4        |
| 2   | Delay to the school opening - managing a split site              | 3                             | 4             | 12     | Concept Design indicates no requirement for a split site.   | 2                           | 1             | 2        |
| 8   | Size of PfS OJEU/ Capacity of PfS Suppliers                      | 4                             | 2             | 8      | Early engagement with PfS Framework Suppliers   | 4                           | 2             | 8        |
| 23  | Government Policy Changes  | 4                             | 2             | 8      | Keep local politicians informed   | 4                           | 2             | 8        |
| 14  | Fit for Educational Purpose - Deliverables                       | 3                             | 3             | 9      | Specification to include Value Measures - Control - Education Brief. Quality Procedures adopted - DQI - BREEAM - CDA etc.   | 3                           | 2             | 6        |

## **APPENDIX 8 – LEADING AND MANAGING CHANGE (NOT USED)**



**APPENDIX 9 - MOVING FORWARD – NOT USED****OBC REQUIRED KPI DATA**

In order to measure the efficiencies and achievements against BSF National priorities the following data is required at OBC stage. Please record both the data values and the relevant document reference.

| Data description   | Units required  | OBC value             | Document reference   |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|
| Cost / m <sup>2</sup> : Total cost per square metre, calculated as the actual final total cost for new construction divided by the gross floor area. | Average £/m <sup>2</sup> for Proposed school(s) scheme              | £1,576/m <sup>2</sup> | Appendix 6<br>Litherland Summary<br>FAM v5   |
| Whole life costs   | Total NPV whole life cost across all Proposed school(s) scheme, £   | Not completed         |  |
| Site works costs   | Total site works cost across all Proposed school(s) scheme, £       | £1,869,922            | Appendix 6<br>Litherland Summary<br>FAM v5   |
| Abnormal costs   | Total abnormal Costs for all Proposed school(s) scheme, £           | £1,439,467            | Appendix 6<br>Litherland Summary<br>FAM v5 &<br>Appendix 6<br>Schedule of<br>Abnormals Costs |
| Number of funding streams predicted for this project in addition to BSF  | Number  | 0                     |  |
| Predicted total amount of multi-agency funding   | £   | 0                     |  |
| Planned travel distance to School per pupil  | Average travel distance for all pupils in Proposed school(s) scheme | 1.38 miles            |  |
| Average number of hours that BSF school(s) will be used for non school activities  | Average hours community use / scheme                                | 15-35 hours per week  |  |

Please also list below any significant assumptions underlying the above data.

### Assumptions

The abnormal costs estimates are set out in the Feasibility Study report and include full details of the assumptions made in determining those cost estimates.

## **APPENDIX 10 - SURVEYS**

The following reports and surveys have been obtained and are included in the CDRom labelled Litherland High School One School Pathfinder Outline Business Case Appendices.

- Topographical survey
- Underground utilities investigation
- Type 3 Asbestos Surveys
- Fully dimensioned measured building surveys - floor plans
- Desk top ground investigation and intrusive investigation scoping
- Intrusive ground investigation including factual and interpretive report
- Previous land use desk top study
- Site noise survey and assessment
- Statutory Utilities searches
- Phase 1 Ecology Habitat Survey (to be completed Summer 08)
- Visual Structural Inspection
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Traffic Impact Assessment

**APPENDIX 11 – PROJECT TEAM SKILLS & EXPERIENCE**

| <b>Name</b>    | <b>Skills &amp; Experience Summary</b>   |
|----------------|--|
| Paul Williams  | A Chartered Engineer and Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers with some 35 years experience in construction in the private and public sectors. From 1998 until March 2008, I have been engaged as Technical Services Director for Sefton MBC responsible for multi-disciplined teams engaged in delivering Highways, Property and Facilities Management services to Council clients, Schools and the wider community. From April 2008, I am employed as the Technical Director for both the OSP Project and the new sixth form college.  |
| Chris Dalziel  | <p>As a former teacher, Christine Dalziel has extensive experience in education and a well-developed understanding of the physical environment needed to deliver outstanding education. She has, for the last 4 1/2 years, been responsible for the management and development of the schools estate to meet the changing demands on education providers and to achieve optimum performance and value from education assets.</p> <p>I currently have full responsibility for the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Asset Management Plan for education buildings.</li> <li>• Manages the Devolved Formula Capital to address condition and suitability defects.</li> <li>• Manages the capital programme.</li> <li>• Works with the Archdiocese and Diocese to develop the LEA Co-ordinated VA Programme (LCVAP).</li> <li>• Ensures sufficient school places are secured in the primary and secondary sector, throughout Sefton.</li> <li>• Publishes statutory notices and provides documentation for all school organisation proposals.</li> <li>• Completes statistical returns.</li> </ul>   |
| Alison Roberts | <p>Chartered Civil Engineer, Member of Institute of Civil Engineers, Prince 2 – Foundation. , RoSPA accredited. Associate Member APM. Seventeen years in engineering and consultancy. Alison has had a wide varied career, working on both UK and overseas projects covering project management, site supervision, detailed design, safety auditing, environmental assessment and contract documentation.</p> <p>Notable Projects Include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operational Project Manager to Litherland One School Pathfinder</li> <li>• Project Manager – Alder Hey Facilities Management</li> <li>• Project Manager – RAF Lakenheath Remediation of Area 205, North Side Dump</li> <li>• Assistant Project Manager – RAF Menwith Hill – UPS Feed to 36M &amp; 36T</li> <li>• Assistant Project Manager – RAF Fairford – MMIF and Restoration of Munitions Storage Facilities</li> <li>• Team Leader/ Design Engineer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– M62, Junction 6</li> <li>– A570/ A59 Feasibility &amp; Public Consultation</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Assistant Resident Engineer - Client Representative – Macclesfield Relief Road</li> </ul> |

| Name                | Skills & Experience Summary   |
|---------------------|---|
| Keith Lovsey        | <p>Seven years in consultancy, noticeable projects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Manager to three One School Pathfinders and one TCF secondary school rebuild.</li> <li>• Programme Management for a £4m National ODPM e-Government project involving 11 Councils and the ODPM delivering e-Services for use in the public sector.</li> </ul> <p>30 years in local government including 13 years in ACO posts, and including the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specification &amp; outsourcing of ICT Services for a Unitary Council</li> <li>• Project Manager for National Grid for Learning ICT Services implementation</li> <li>• ICT Manager for a Unitary Council – take on of County Council services at abolition of a County Council</li> <li>• Year 2000 Project Manager</li> <li>• Project and Operations Manager for implementation of Council Tax and Housing Benefits</li> <li>• Project and Operation Manager for Implementation of the Community Charge &amp; Benefits; including specification and development of the computer systems used by 11 Councils including 2 London Boroughs</li> </ul> |
| Liz Gatheral        | <p>Liz Gatheral, Architectural Projects Group Manager, Sefton MB Council. Liz is a chartered architect with some 20 years experience in the development and delivery of construction projects. Liz has attained the RIBA certificate in Project Management and is a qualified BREEAM Assessor. She is currently responsible for co-ordinating and directing on a commercial basis, a multi-disciplinary professional services team comprising architects, quantity surveyors, project managers and clerk of works to deliver all the Council's major new build and refurbishment schemes within defined budgets and programmes. She is responsible for a broad range of projects undertaken across the education, leisure, community and regeneration sectors. Liz has introduced partnered procurement systems to the Council and is now developing framework agreements. Liz has experience of a wide variety of procurement routes and forms of contract.</p>  |
| Graham Winckles     | <p>I am a Chartered Architect, with 30 years post-qualification experience in both the public and private sectors. I have advised a wide range of clients on their construction projects, especially in the education and leisure sectors.</p> <p>Prior to my present position with 2020 Liverpool Ltd I was Assistant Director of a north-west Metropolitan Borough Council, and for over 16 years headed their multi-disciplinary design consultancy comprising architects, engineers and other professional staff.</p> <p>In November 2005, I was appointed as an RIBA Register of Client Design Advisors with my educational experience being recognised as a particular strength.</p>  |
| Wayne Leatherbarrow | <p>20yrs experience of the ICT industry, delivering solutions to private and public sector.</p> <p>I am responsible for IM&amp;T policy, strategy and service delivery for Sefton Children's Services.</p> <p>ITIL accredited service delivery manager, MSP accredited programme manager, Prince.2 accredited practitioner.</p>   |

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| Caroline Elwood | I am a qualified Solicitor and the Legal Director and Monitoring Officer at Sefton Council, a post I have held since 2002. Prior to that, I was Director of Corporate Services and Deputy Chief Executive at Preston City Council, a post held for four years. I am an experienced Monitoring Officer and have spent my career in Local Government taking Articles with Salford City Council and moving subsequently to Vale Royal Borough Council. I am a Member of ACSeS, hold the Diploma in Local Government Law & Practice and have successfully completed the LGMB's Top Managers Programme |
|-----------------|---|

| Name          | Skills & Experience Summary  |
|---------------|--|
| Alan Potter   | As Assistant Director (Schools) I will provide an overview of how the school's curriculum provision to ensure it meets current and future statutory requirements and be organised so it is both inclusive and meeting the personalised needs of the young people in the school. This includes ensuring the ability of the school to act as part of the South Sefton 14-19 Collaborative with strong relationships with other schools, the Sixth Form Centre and local colleges and employers.  |
| Danny Roberts | Responsible for monitoring and evaluating educational provision in Sefton Schools and providing support in inverse proportion to success.  |
| Jim Donnelly  | Headteacher of Litherland High School since 1991 – rated “Outstanding” by OFSTED (2008)<br>Seconded to DfES (ICT, Academies’ Programme and CPD), part-time 2000-2005<br>Secondary Heads’ Association spokesperson on ICT from 1989<br>Author of many books and articles on the use of ICT in the curriculum and for school management<br>Responsible for the management of several building projects at Litherland High School<br>Member of Management Board of South Sefton City Learning Centre since its inception, which included responsibility for the £1.2 million Capital Programme (including a major ICT commitment)<br>Responsible within Sefton LA for managing the ICT strategy with schools. |

## APPROVALS CHECKLIST

### Pre Procurement Assessment of Project Proposals for the National Framework or for Single-School Additions to BSF

#### General guidance:

This document is intended as a self assessment form for the LA to complete. The LA should consider each of the questions below and answer yes/no to each point raised. Where required the LA should include the name, profession and current position of key personnel. For further guidance, the LA should refer to the appropriate PfS Outline Business Case guidance document and to their PfS Project Director.

PfS should consider the responses given by the LA and the project proposals as submitted. PfS can add comments to support/challenge the responses given by the LA as they deem appropriate.

DCSF will consider the responses given and review the project proposals as submitted by the LA. The DSCF will annotate each question as acceptable/unacceptable. DSCF will refer any unacceptable issues back to PfS for further consideration/discussion with the LA.

| Consideration   | LA Response  | PfS Comments | DCSF ACC/UnA                        |
|---|--|--------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Does the LA have enough appropriately qualified resources in place to deliver this project?<br>Who has the LA appointed to the following key roles:<br><br>a) LA Design Champion<br>b) Client Design Adviser<br>c) Technical Advisers<br>d) ICT Advisers                 | Yes  |              | Acc/UnA                             |
|   | Please include name, profession and current position.<br><br>a) Liz Gatheral<br>b) Graham Winckles<br>c) SMBC Tech. Services<br>d) SMBC e-Services |              | Acc/UnA<br><br>a)<br>b)<br>c)<br>d) |
| 2. Has a robust and thorough options appraisal been carried out to determine the project proposals?<br>Were Building Bulletin 98 / Building Bulletin 77 used to develop these proposals?<br>Was Asset Management Planning data reflected fully in developing the proposals? | Yes  |              | Acc/UnA                             |
|   | Yes  |              | Acc/UnA                             |
|   | Yes  |              | Acc/UnA                             |
| 3. Have all stakeholders been consulted in developing the project proposals?<br>Is there stakeholder support for the project?   | Yes  |              | Acc/UnA                             |
|   | Yes  |              | Acc/UnA                             |

| Consideration  | LA Response          | PfS Comments | DCSF<br>ACC/UnA |
|--|----------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| 4. Has the LA confirmed their intention to follow the Design Quality Indicators process?   | Yes                  |              | Acc/UnA         |
| Has the LA appointed a recognised Design Quality Indicator Facilitator?  | Yes for RIBA Stage B |              | Acc/UnA         |
| 5. Has a design brief been developed?  | Yes                  |              | Acc/UnA         |
| Can the LA confirm they require a BREEAM rating of very good or excellent for this project?  | Yes                  |              | Acc/UnA         |
| Does the LA have a clear policy on sustainability that will need to be met by this project?  | Yes                  |              | Acc/UnA         |
| 6. Has an initial cost estimate been prepared for the proposed project?  | Yes                  |              | Acc/UnA         |
| Does this estimate include an assessment of likely abnormal costs including consideration of initial site investigations that have been carried out? | Yes                  |              | Acc/UnA         |
| Has a value-for-money assessment been conducted that shows the proposed project as good value for money?   | Yes                  |              | Acc/UnA         |
| 7. Does this estimate indicate that the proposals are affordable within the funding allocation?  | No                   |              | Acc/UnA         |
| If not, has the LA indicated how they propose to meet any shortfall?   | Yes                  |              | Acc/UnA         |
| 8. Can the LA provide a copy of a section 151 letter or Local Cabinet approval to proposals including acceptance of any affordability issues?        | Yes                  |              | Acc/UnA         |
| 9. Has a detailed risk register for the project been developed?  | Yes                  |              | Acc/UnA         |
| Has the LA developed a clear strategy to manage/mitigate risks?  | Yes                  |              | Acc/UnA         |



| Consideration   | LA Response | PfS Comments | DCSF<br>ACC/UnA |
|---|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| 10. Are there any statutory issues to resolve such as Planning/Highways/section 77/ section 106 etc?<br>Has LA commenced necessary procedures?  | No          |              | Acc/UnA         |
|   | N/A         |              | Acc/UnA         |
| 11. If ICT is included in the procurement:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Has a robust and thorough ICT options appraisal been carried out to determine the ICT approach?</li> <li>- Is the proposed ICT scope and approach in line with the overarching ICT strategy of the LA?</li> <li>- Have all stakeholders been consulted in developing the ICT proposals?</li> <li>- Has an initial cost estimate been prepared for the ICT project?</li> <li>- Has a value-for-money assessment been conducted that shows the proposed ICT project as good value for money?</li> <li>- Does the estimate indicate that the proposals are affordable within the funding allocation?</li> <li>- If the proposals are not affordable, then has the LA indicated how they propose to meet any shortfall?</li> <li>- Is the ICT project included in the Section 151 letter or Local Cabinet approval to proposals including acceptance of any affordability issues?</li> </ul> | N/A for OSP |              |                 |
|   |             |              |                 |
|   |             |              |                 |
|   |             |              |                 |
|   |             |              |                 |
|   |             |              |                 |
|   |             |              |                 |
|   |             |              |                 |
|   |             |              |                 |
|   |             |              |                 |

| Consideration   | LA Response   | PfS Comments | DCSF ACC/UnA |
|---|---|--------------|--------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Has a detailed risk register for the ICT project been developed?</li> <li>- Has the LA developed a clear strategy to manage / mitigate ICT risks?</li> <li>- Where applicable, has the ICT contract been completed to a satisfactory level</li> <li>- Where applicable, has the ICT Output Specification been completed to a satisfactory level</li> </ul> | <p>This work has been started but is not a specific requirement for an OSP project. Details of the ICT work Plan is included at Appendix 4 to the OBC.</p>  |              |              |
|   | <p>An ICT Output Specification has been produced. This will be further developed into the Functional and Technical Specification for procurement of ICT Services through the BECTA Framework.</p> |              |              |
| <p>Signed by the Director of Children Services for the Local Authority:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Date:</p>   |   |              |              |
| <p>Are there any fundamental issues/concerns that should be addressed before commencing procurement of this project?</p> <p>PfS:</p> <p>DCSF:</p>   |   |              |              |