

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE’S SERVICE
ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN - LOCAL POLICY STATEMENT

CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. National Context
3. Key Factors in North Yorkshire
4. The Vision for Learning
5. Information about CYPS Property – Asset Management Planning
6. Design and Technical Standards
7. Sources of Capital Funding
8. Strategic Priorities – Current Capital Programme
9. Future Priorities for Investment
10. Delivery of Capital Projects
11. Documents Replaced
12. Date for Review – December 2017

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICE
ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN - LOCAL POLICY STATEMENT

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. North Yorkshire County Council is committed to raising school standards. This ambition has always been the foundation of its planning for the Children and Young People's Service.
- 1.2. North Yorkshire County Council is also committed to maintain to a good standard all buildings from which Children and Young People's Services are delivered. Building improvements will contribute to raising educational standards and to unlocking the educational potential of every child.
- 1.3. Raising standards of achievement through good education is key, but all the Council's Corporate Priorities¹ have an impact on education and service provision in the County.
- 1.4. The Children and Young People's Service, which in 2006 brought together Education and Children's Social Care into a single Council Directorate follows a strategy set out in *Young and Yorkshire: the Children and Young People's Plan 2014-2017*²
- 1.5. It has been a number of years since the Local Priority Statement which spells out the County Council's priorities was refreshed. This is due to the major review of school capital undertaken by central government and emerging policy over how schools capital would be allocated and managed in the future.
- 1.6. The government's longer term response to some of the more revolutionary proposals in the James Review of Schools Capital is still unclear and it appears unlikely that they will be implemented in the foreseeable future. It is therefore proposed that the Local Priority Statement (which forms part of the County Council's Policy Framework) should be updated this year, the previous version dating back to 2007.

2. NATIONAL CONTEXT

There are a number of key national factors which impact on our priorities for the allocation of capital.

- 2.1 The government commissioned the James Review of Schools Capital after it cancelled *Building Schools for the Future* in 2010, the previous government's flagship capital programme. The review found BSF procurement routes to be inefficient and considered alternative central delivery models for capital

investment. This led to the central retention of significant funding for “demand led” programmes such as Free Schools. While the recommendation that a central body, not local authorities, should design and deliver larger projects has not been fully implemented, the centralisation of funding for demand –led programmes has reduced capital allocations paid to local authorities since 2010.

- 2.2 Some recommendations of the review have already been implemented, while others have influenced our capital allocations from the DfE. There has been a reduction in the number of targeted funding streams, following the review’s recommendation that there should be a single flexible pot for capital. There is less of a requirement to bid for targeted capital, following the recommendation that there should be transparency about the formula used by central government to set this single capital pot.
- 2.3 The review also criticised BSF’s transformational approach to buildings and recommended that the goal for capital investment should be the creation of fit-for-purpose schools. This has led to more of a reliance on condition data by DfE, a reduction in the area guidelines for schools and the publication of standard designs for schools based on those reduced net areas and utilitarian principles.
- 2.4 The James Review recommended a single flexible pot so that responsible bodies could set investment plans which meet the demands within their local area - though there is some tension between this and the centralisation of funding for demand led programmes. Local Policy Statements were originally introduced to help provide a mechanism for some local autonomy, that could be assessed. In line with the previous government’s principle that local spending autonomy was allowed in proportion to their confidence in the Authority’s systems, a satisfactory or above classification indicated DfE approval for up to 3 years. Assessments of the AMP no longer occur and capital allocations are made annually on a formulaic basis. However, it would seem sensible to continue with this framework for ensuring that local prioritisation of spending on school premises is a transparent process which all stakeholders feel confident is fair and equitable .

3. LOCAL FACTORS IN NORTH YORKSHIRE

Key local factors which impact on our priorities for the allocation of capital are:-

- 3.1 North Yorkshire is amongst the top performing authorities. Raising standards from a high base is a major challenge and requires targeted, significant resources.
- 3.2 *Building Schools for the Future*, the previous government’s strategic investment programme for secondary schools, required evidence of deprivation, measured in terms of free school meals. However this measure, and similarly, the national Indices of Multiple Deprivation, show that child poverty in North Yorkshire is low compared to national levels. This meant that funding formulas with a deprivation element, such as BSF, failed to deliver significant investment in North Yorkshire, in spite of the area having pockets of deprivation. This indicator was key to why North Yorkshire was not eligible to rebuild a significant number of its secondary schools under BSF.

- 3.3 North Yorkshire has a large number of rural primary schools, which are usually small schools with low numbers. Around 40% of our primary schools have under 90 pupils. This is because 51% of the County's population lives in areas which are defined as "sparse" or "super sparse". These areas comprise 96% of the County. Some rural primary schools, particularly those with low numbers on roll, are on the margins of financial viability. However, in sparse rural areas travel distances for young children to alternative schools can be onerous. The challenge of small rural primary schools has been a key factor underlying some decisions about the use of schools' capital.
- 3.4 High levels of pupil mobility in certain areas of the County, such as the Catterick Garrison, also affect the planning of school places. The army's rebasing plan will drive high pupil mobility in schools across the Garrison, for example. Providing, at relatively short notice, sufficient places across schools on the Garrison to cover the proposed draw down of troops from the Rhine is a significant factor in school organisation and capital planning.
- 3.5 Rurality and pupil mobility can both have an impact on the sustainability of some schools. Rural primary schools can struggle with low numbers and yet, in sparse areas, transport costs to alternatives would be high if they closed. High mobility in certain parts of the county presents a significant challenge in terms of financing additional capacity and "surplus" school places. Providing sufficient additional capacity to cope with a sudden influx of pupils is a drain on funding.
- 3.6 For several years North Yorkshire pupil numbers fell, at a rate comparable to other areas in the county. The picture changed as the increase in the birth rate nationally saw North Yorkshire pupil numbers start to rise again from 2011/12 onwards. This rise in the birth rate started to take effect at school level, so that an underlying upward trend in primary pupil numbers is now beginning to show in secondary school numbers. This change from falling to rising numbers has had a significant impact on the sufficiency of some urban schools. This will continue to be the case as rising numbers continue to be a key factor underlying decisions about the use of capital to expand schools, particularly in urban areas.
- 3.7 Within urban areas of the County there are some significant growth areas for housing proposed in their Local Plans. In contrast to the sparsity of housing in its rural areas, in urban areas of the County, such as Harrogate, Scarborough, Selby, Northallerton and Thirsk, many more substantial housing developments are proposed, subject to the housing allocations within the Local Plans for those urban areas being built out. These patterns of significant urban growth, which require a corresponding expansion of local schools and in several cases the building of new primary schools, also need to be reflected in our priorities for capital allocations.
- 3.8 Significant urban growth, extreme rurality and pupil mobility has led to a mixed strategy for school place planning, with some rural schools working together to remain viable and other urban schools expanding. This mixed strategy is reflected in the current Capital Programme and is an important element in the Council's capital planning. The current Capital Programme gives priority to securing viability through amalgamations and other school re-organisation and also to the provision of additional places.
- 3.9 Urban growth and rurality have combined to mask the true level of growing need for additional places, when surpluses in sparse areas of the County are grouped

with predicted urban shortfalls. Surplus places on the rural perimeter of a locality may mask shortfalls within its urban core. There has been a review of primary school planning areas in recent years which has led to a more realistic measure of need.

- 3.10 CYPS will contribute significantly to the Council's revenue savings which are planned as part of the One Council and subsequent 2020 savings programmes. Yet these revenue savings are difficult for CYPS to achieve while still operating effectively over the very large geographical area North Yorkshire covers. In addition, there have been reductions in our capital funding streams. There has also been a reduction in the devolved allocation to schools. The Authority has traditionally operated support services for schools and settings on a very lean model and the current financial pressure will require further rationalisation. In order to operate more effectively across this wide area whilst at the same time ensuring safe and appropriate coverage it will be necessary to reconfigure and co-locate service. This may require capital investment to achieve long term revenue savings.

4. THE VISION FOR LEARNING

- 4.1. In preparing *Young and Yorkshire: the Children and Young People's Plan 2014-2017* it was felt important to refresh the overall Vision for the future of services for children and young people. The Vision statement is:
We want North Yorkshire to be a special place where every childhood is magical and every young person thrives³.
- 4.2. This ambition which is for everyone who grows up in North Yorkshire, sits above a set of ten guiding *Principles* that will underpin our work with children and young people, including involving children in planning and evaluating services, resolving families problems before they escalate, striving for excellence and working in close partnerships in the interests of children. The *Principles* serve to remind us of the things that remain important in everything we do.
- 4.3. The Plan's three particular priorities for 2014 – 17 are:
- Ensuring that education is our greatest liberator
 - Keeping families together
 - Ensuring a healthy start to life.
- 4.4. To realise the first priority, we believe that, a greater proportion of pupils in North Yorkshire should go to a good or outstanding school or setting and that no school should fall into a category of concern. This is also reflected in the *14-19 Education and Skills Position Statement*.
- 4.5. The Service will deliver the vision by supporting improvement in schools through partnerships. By supporting and enabling strong school leadership and management and through early intervention when necessary, we aim to work in partnership with schools to bring about the best possible education for our children and young people.
- 4.6. The Plan is delivered across localities, which are based in the communities in which children and young people are educated. Partnerships between schools are encouraged both within the school cluster in the locality and between localities both for teaching and learning purposes and extended schools

activities. In this way the Plan aims to put children's life chances in their own hands, rather than being determined by geography or family circumstances.

5. INFORMATION ABOUT CYPS PROPERTY

5.1 The Asset Management Planning (AMP) records encompass the following:

- The **Suitability** of school premises to meet curriculum needs
- The physical **Condition** of premises to ensure continuous operation.
- The capacity within schools and the **Sufficiency** of places across schools
- Water and energy **consumption** costs.
- **Asbestos** records

The Council maintains these records within the Corporate Asset Register.

5.2 Up-to-date plans of all school buildings are maintained. Unique room numbers and room uses match up with the condition data, and capacity schedules held for each school. All of this information is cross matched with the plans.

Plans are regularly updated when work has been undertaken on CYPS sites and subsequent amendments made to condition and capacity data.

School data is held on the County Council Corporate Asset Register alongside other corporate assets. A web-enabling process has been implemented, which allows schools to view records for their own buildings on-line⁴.

5.3. Property condition surveys have demonstrated that there is a substantial maintenance backlog within North Yorkshire schools. It is therefore important that investment continues to be made in maintaining the fabric of buildings. The total maintenance backlog in schools across the County is currently more than £30m and for this reason we have had to focus our funding on the areas of greatest need. In addition, while schools contribute devolved resources to any maintenance project the continued low values of Devolved Formula Capital has had an impact on the level of funding required to support the Capital Maintenance Programme.

5.4 More generally, apart from condition data informing maintenance needs, the AMP has had one broad benefit. Analysis of our AMP data has given us a more systematic, objective and transparent approach to capital planning. In order for our AMP to retain this benefit, it needs keeping up to date through a rolling programme of condition surveys. The Condition data is updated by our property consultants Jacobs UK. Capacity data is updated as projects are completed. We do this for projects run by Jacobs UK but where schools use other designers, they must supply the data at the end of the project. Data on water and energy consumption costs is collated by the Energy Team.

5.5 While our condition surveys are elemental, the DfE's additional Property Data Survey Programme is higher level. The purpose of the Property Data Survey Programme is to enable a more transparent allocation by the DfE of capital maintenance. Our surveys help to inform investment priorities and will not be replaced by the national Property Data.

6. STANDARDS

- 6.1 The process of design is currently handled on the Council's behalf by Jacobs UK with the involvement of Investment and Delivery Team within Corporate Property Service where appropriate. Design follows the standard plan of work stages of the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA).
- 6.2 All projects are planned in accordance with Department Regulations and Guidance. The key regulations are the Education (School Premises) Regulations which is the statutory instrument which applies to all maintained schools and which cover minimum standards for both new and existing premises. Apart from specifying minimum levels of toilet provision and playing fields, most of these provisions are general, with cross reference to other guidance.
- 6.3 In addition to the Department's regulations, there are its codes of practice, which offer non-statutory guidance. The key document is the recently revised Area Guidelines for Schools. This is Building Bulletin 103. The recommended gross areas, which includes circulation space, have been slightly reduced from the previous BB98 and BB99 guidelines, though the recommended class sizes remain broadly comparable⁵.
- 6.4 These legislative regulations and non-statutory guidelines are the standards which we follow for new buildings (along with other legislative requirements, such as Building Regulation Approval, etc). The new guidelines are the benchmark but in practice some existing spaces of smaller sizes may still work without undue impact on teaching or learning.

7. SOURCES OF FUNDING

This section sets out the main sources of funding according to two groups:

- funding held by the County Council as Local Authority
- funding held by schools

The DfE allocated capital funding of £18.29m to North Yorkshire schools for 2014/15. The County Council will administer £13.9m of the funding for 2014/15. The remaining £4.4m is delegated to schools, including Voluntary Aided Schools.

7.1 County Council held funding

This is still the main source of capital funding for Community, Voluntary Controlled and Foundation schools.

- 7.1.1 Before 2010 there were a relatively large number of dedicated funding streams developed by the DfE for spending on targeted areas. For example there was the Building Schools for the Future Programme, the Primary Capital Programme, the Modernisation Fund, the Targeted Capital Fund, and the Schools Access Initiative. These dedicated grants usually supported specific national priorities and were often available via a bidding process. However, the number of funding streams the County Council now primarily administers has been reduced to two. These two are more flexible than the earlier dedicated funds and are allocated to Local Authorities by DfE on a formulaic basis driven mostly by pupils numbers, rather than bidding against set criteria.
- 7.1.2 As in 2013/14 the allocation to the local authority in 2014/15 consisted primarily of two funding streams – Basic Need and Capital Maintenance (although an additional allocation of £1.45m was made for investment in school kitchens to

support the implementation of Universal Infant Free School Meals in September 2014).

- 7.1.3 The Basic Need and Capital Maintenance allocations are part of the Single Capital Pot and can be used for all local priorities although they are intended primarily for investment in schools and children's centres. They can be used together.
- 7.1.4 The only other centrally administered capital pot into which local authorities can bid at this time is the Priority Schools Building Programme 2 for those schools classed as in the very worst condition, as defined by the national Property Data Survey. A number of bids were made to this programme in July 2014 with decisions anticipated in December 2014. Projects will be delivered from 2015 to 2020.
- 7.1.5 Basic need funding is expected to meet the needs for growth in pupil numbers in relation to all state funded schools in the area, including any Academies. Academies receive their funding for capital maintenance and devolved capital direct from the Education Funding Agency (EFA).
- 7.1.6 Capital maintenance does not have to be used strictly for maintenance; it can also be used for other capital improvement works. Capital maintenance for schools which have applied to convert to Academy status, but have not yet converted, is not included in the local authority's allocation. Converting Academies receive their capital maintenance funding direct from the EFA.
- 7.1.7 In spite of the permitted flexibility of use, in reality there is not a significant contrast with previous dedicated grants. While there are no longer numerous targeted funding streams, Basic Need funding is not really that flexible. DfE has started monitoring local authorities' expenditure on Basic Need very closely to ensure that it is being targeted on creating additional places. Ministers are known to be seeking reassurance on this point quite specifically from local authorities via the EFA and publish a scorecard on how local authorities perform in their spending of Basic Need capital.
- 7.1.8 Capital allocations come as a mixture of grant and supported borrowing in the form of credit approvals (the permission to local authorities to borrow). NYCC's allocation is currently 100% grant funded (no borrowing approvals or PFI). There is no time-limit on expenditure so it can be carried forward if unspent at the end of the financial year. This may be necessary to ensure that sufficient funding is available for the peak demand of primary places anticipated in 2017 and beyond, particularly where housing developments advance more slowly than anticipated.
- 7.1.9 In addition to Basic Need, the County Council pursues contributions towards the costs of additional schools places arising from all significant housing developments. Section 106 funding (or Community Infrastructure Levy) comes to the County Council rather than to schools but, unlike Basic Need, it is not centrally administered by the DfE or EFA. The level of funding is calculated based on a national formula and is collected from developers in accordance with agreements entered into prior to planning consent being granted by District Councils. There is considerable pressure on this source of funding as developers grapple with the financial viability of housing development.

7.2 **School Held Funding**

7.2.1 Revenue Maintenance

Since 1988, schools have had money in their LMS budget for repairs and maintenance. Increased amounts were delegated in 1998 and 2001. Following the delegation of 2001, the Council set up the PREMISES Scheme which was an optional scheme of repairs and maintenance which most schools joined. Repairs and maintenance is a complex responsibility and the PREMISES Scheme was replaced with a new Maintenance and Servicing Scheme (MASS) which aimed to simplify the system. This was implemented from April 2011. Around 75% of schools take part in the scheme with the remainder making their own arrangements. Further delegation of funding for legionella management is proposed in 2015/16.

7.2.2 Devolved Formula Capital

For a number of years, schools have also received Devolved Capital. Schools are encouraged to use it to address condition related works. It is expected that schools will prioritise health and safety, fire safety, legionella, asbestos and other regulatory requirements from their DFC. DFC also now includes ICT funding. Schools are expected to contribute DFC to their County funded schemes and therefore a significant proportion of the delegated funding may be used to support County Council managed schemes.

7.3 Other Sources of funding

- 7.3.1 Occasionally opportunities arise for bids to be submitted in respect of specific funding streams. However, bidding deadlines and criteria are often restrictive so such opportunities are limited. In recent years this has included a number of Sport England grants.

8. **STRATEGIC PRIORITIES**

8.1 Previous Capital Programmes

- 8.1.1 Priorities in previous capital programmes were sometimes driven by dedicated grants. These funding streams aimed to achieve a number of key priorities at national level. For example:

- Sure Start capital built most of our Children Centres
- Primary Capital Programme funding was ring fenced to rebuild (or substantially refurbish) a small number of our primary schools, as outlined in our PCP Strategy for Change
- Targeted Capital Funds were ring fenced to reflect various national priorities, such as TCF 14-19 for vocational schemes, TCF Rural and TCF Practical Cooking Spaces
- The LA's Accessibility Strategy for making schools as accessible as possible, was funded from the dedicated Schools Access Initiative grant.

- 8.1.2 Our capital programmes were adjusted to reflect changing national priorities within the available funding. While a major challenge in planning the Capital Programme effectively was to bring together the resources available to the authority through the various dedicated grants detailed above, a further essential element of this appraisal was to also deliver our local priorities.

- 8.1.3 The investment required to meet gaps in funding for the Special Educational Needs and Behaviour Review is one example. A local priority was the need for significant capital resources to implement the initial phases of the SEN and

Behaviour Review, including the development of more than 20 enhanced provisions in mainstream schools, three new PRUs and a new BESD school for the west of the County.

- 8.1.4 The inclusion of projects to replace temporary classrooms with permanent build is another example. This local priority recognised long standing concerns of the Council's Planning & Regulatory Functions Committee and the bulk of units included in the replacement programme were those identified as being in the worst condition. In addition following consultation with the schools concerned, over 25 units were removed where numbers on roll had fallen below capacity.

8.2 The Current Capital Programme

- 8.2.1 Earlier capital funding streams enabled Capital Programmes to be developed for the above dedicated grants but to include our local priorities such as the SEN and Behaviour Review and temporary classroom replacements.
- 8.2.3 The current capital programme does not need to reflect the priorities of so many dedicated funding streams. It is based on two funds (Basic Need and Capital Maintenance) which do not require a bidding process. The two main allocations are now formulaic and can be used relatively flexibly to address local priorities.
- 8.2.4 The first priority of the current capital programme is provision for additional school places. The previous capital programme provided 900 new school places in 24 schools (largely primary) through the Basic Need programme. The 2014/15 programme will add a further 230 places at 6 primary schools for September 2015 and make a start to the development of a wholly new primary school to serve the Staynor Hall area of Selby.
- 8.2.5 The current capital programme also gives priority to securing rapid improvement through school re-organisation. Members agreed, for example, to prioritise investment in major school re-organisation in North Craven.
- 8.2.6 The capital programme also advances a number of projects aimed at improving and modernising school facilities. This includes the refurbishment of science laboratories and other specialist teaching accommodation such as design technology, drama, music and art. These modernisation schemes are driven by priorities identified by schools themselves in their discussions with CYPS officers.
- 8.2.7 It also prioritises the replacement or demolition of portable classroom units whose condition assessment has determined that they are beyond economic repair or at risk of becoming unsafe.
- 8.2.8 Other priorities for current investment include: compliance issues arising out of fire risk, legionella and radon protection audits; major structural works where schools have suffered significant structural issues; kitchen improvement works; and maintaining the fabric of buildings through capital maintenance.

9 THE FUTURE – 2015 AND BEYOND

This section addresses the anticipated strategic priorities for 2015 and beyond. All future priorities are aspirations subject to capital availability⁶.

- 9.1 **Extra accommodation** - Provision of extra accommodation needed for growth will be the first priority. The Local Authority has a statutory duty to ensure sufficient places for children in North Yorkshire. The demand for primary school places will grow significantly over the next ten years due to an increase in birth rate and major housing developments in urban parts of North Yorkshire.

Currently over 10% of all primary places are unfilled though, based on population growth alone, this county-wide surplus is forecast to reduce over the next five years. This figure is county-wide. When North Yorkshire is taken as a whole, surplus places in sparse rural areas of the county mask shortfalls in its urban areas. This can even occur over the County's localities where shortfalls in the urban core of a locality are masked by surplus places in other parts of the wider area.

It is clear that in some places significant numbers of additional primary places will be needed. While the scale and timing will be determined by the speed at which housing comes forward, it is not clear that all these places can be easily afforded. Although the additional £39.3m allocated for 2015/16 and 2016/17 will go a long way towards meeting this need it is unlikely that it will fully fund the requirements. On current estimates a further £18m would be needed to fully deliver the required primary places. CYPS will continue to pursue s106 or CIL contributions to support infrastructure development associated with housing to supplement Basic Need funding.

A programme of primary school expansion was approved by the Executive in Sept 2014 for delivery of places up to Sept 2017. In recent years it has been necessary given the pressure on resources to restrict additional teaching space to the provision of portable or modular classrooms wherever possible on cost grounds. Detailed analysis has shown that there is still a significant difference in cost between portable units and traditional build but this has narrowed in recent years and this approach may not represent best value in every case. Modular/system build or offsite construction will also be considered as a lower cost alternative to traditional build although again the difference in costs has been shown to depend on site constraints including planning. Decisions on construction methods will therefore need to be made on a site by site basis. Where pupil places are needed on a genuinely temporary basis to provide transitional or 'bulge' places this will be provided through portable buildings which can be relocated at a later date.

Consideration will also need to be given to the sufficiency of places for early years education in parallel with the provision of places for children of statutory school age.

- 9.2 **Special Educational Needs and Behaviour Review** - has advanced to the extent that enhanced provisions and new PRU provisions are complete. The next phase of implementation will be the rationalisation of special school provision.
- 9.3 **School Modernisation** – Projects aimed at improving and modernising school facilities are welcomed by many schools who tend to request support for such projects. It is proposed to invest capital into projects which aim to bring specialist teaching accommodation at a number of schools up to modern curriculum standards and to ensure they are suitable and fit for purpose. This would include the refurbishment of science laboratories and other specialist teaching accommodation such as drama, dance, art, vocational areas and design

technology. There would also be a small number of projects reconfiguring accommodation in primary schools to aid curriculum delivery.

Although not curricula driven, the importance of modernising toilet and hygiene facilities is emphasised by many schools and is a priority for capital expenditure.

It is not possible to fund all of the projects which schools have asked the local authority to support. In particular, there are a number of secondary schools which would like to improve their sports facilities. Beyond refurbishment of changing rooms, it is not possible with current levels of allocations to fund the rebuilding of sports halls or athletics tracks. The Local Authority will continue to support schools bidding for funding from various sporting bodies to support such improvement and may need to consider in some circumstances providing match-funding.

9.4 **Inclusion** - Central to the *Vision and Principles* underpinning *Young and Yorkshire: the Children and Young People's Plan 2014-2017* is helping vulnerable and disadvantaged children who are in need of additional help and support as a result of the challenging circumstances they face in their day to day lives. The Plan gives various examples of children who may be vulnerable or disadvantaged. It is important to note that the Plan aims to improve outcomes across a wide range of issues and consequently there may be different groups of vulnerable or disadvantaged children specifically supported by different actions set out in the Plan. What can be said is that the Plan is underpinned by inclusivity and therefore that a priority for capital expenditure needs to be support for inclusive projects that support young people or families who are in need of additional help and support.

9.5 **Re-organisation or Improvement of Provision** – As numbers of pupils decline in small rural primary schools in sparse and super sparse areas so inevitably the sustainability of existing patterns of schooling may come into question in some areas. Some capital funding may be needed to facilitate amalgamations or closures of schools arising from reviews of provision. At primary level this has been identified as high priority for investment.

In addition to addressing urgent concerns about the financial and educational sustainability of some schools, school improvement is a key priority where support from the local authority can be vital in securing rapid improvement in the quality of school provision. There will be a continued emphasis on supporting school improvement through collaboration between schools and the restructuring of educational provision. For example, in addition to the previous investment in major school re-organisation in North Craven, five schemes of this kind are being supported in the current capital programme and three of these are amalgamations of paired primary schools. In addition it is proposed to explore the use of capital to support further school improvements, such as the rationalisation of accommodation at Settle College and requirements emerging from the merger of Whitby Community College with Cademon School.

9.6 **Non-Traditional Construction** – There are investment requirements associated with all properties of non-traditional construction. For example, a critical look will be needed at HORSAs prefabricated accommodation particularly where used for teaching or dining. We also have Airey type property and the ROSLA blocks that may require some form of attention, as well as other issues associated with CLASP buildings.

A priority associated with non-traditional construction is to continue to focus on replacing the oldest temporary classrooms, where such accommodation is justified by numbers on roll. On behalf of CYPS Jacobs reassessed the condition of portable classroom units in 2012 and determined that a small number were beyond economic repair or at risk of becoming unsafe. Where the school has no further use for them in the long term they are removed or demolished to reduce the school's maintenance liabilities.

Where new or replacement teaching accommodation is required this will be with permanent buildings wherever possible although in some cases it will be necessary to consider portable or modular solutions. Portable solutions will also be provided where accommodation is genuinely temporary. These would be to a specification which is energy efficient and provides a pleasant environment for learning.

- 9.7 **Regulatory Changes and Compliance Issues** – The authority will need to continue to invest in ensuring building related regulations are met including asbestos, legionella, fire safety, window filming and other health and safety related issues. For example, the programme to address legionella risk and the radon protection strategy are both likely to require further investment. While there are specific programmes, health and safety issues are also inherent in the design of all projects. For example, there will be some revenue funding for asbestos related works, but asbestos removal arising in relation to individual projects will continue to be funded from project budgets.

Elimination of any hazardous situations which have a health and safety implication is rated a high priority in the context of condition assessments as well as via specific health and safety and fire risk assessments within schools. The traded health and safety service for schools, which has a high take-up, is a source of help and support to schools on health and safety related issues.

It is becoming increasingly necessary for the County Council to help schools with issues emerging from OFSTED inspections around the health, safety and welfare of pupils, including boundary and internal security issues which may have a bearing on judgements around the safeguarding of children. With reduced DFC schools often have insufficient funding to address these security issues themselves and look to the local authority for support. The cost of such adaptations can be high and financial provision will be required to fund this priority. It will also be used to support schools to address any urgent health and safety requirements arising out of health and safety audits where it may be necessary to act quickly to ensure the facilities are not taken out of use.

- 9.8 **Non School CYPS Premises** – In spite of the statutory nature of Children's Social Care and other services there is no separate allocation to meet the need of these services. In previous years it has been possible to undertake a number of projects in Youth premises, Children's Centres, Children's Social Care and Outdoor Education properties. Any discussion about future strategic investment in non-school premises would need to take account of the County Council wide approach to property rationalisation contained within the 2020 North Yorkshire programme and on-going service review.

- 9.9 **Managing Risks to Property** - Increasing issues with the drainage of school fields and flooding have been identified. Feasibility work has been undertaken in respect of a number of schools and it is likely that some works will have to be progressed, in particular to manage the risk of claims against the authority.

Other risks to property and the impact upon curriculum delivery are additional criteria for considering investment decisions within this priority.

- 9.10 **ICT and Furniture** - Increasingly large elements of capital are required for specialist furniture provision on capital projects which is procured through YPO or other framework suppliers. The CYPS ICT Strategy lays out strategic thinking around ICT development across children's service including schools.

There is no allocation of capital for ICT following the withdrawal of the Harnessing Technology fund in 2011/12. It is assumed by government that all infrastructure needs for schools ICT are now met through school budgets. ICT requirements arising from capital projects will be met from project budgets as will any fixed or loose furniture and equipment.

- 9.11 **Kitchen and dining** – The government announced that from September 2014 every child in Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 in state funded schools will receive a free school lunch and provided capital funding to assist with the implementation of this policy. Funding has been prioritised towards the schools which will feel the biggest impact of the new policy and in particular those which currently bring meals in from other schools. Although some funding has been made available in the current capital programme, it is likely that there will need to be further investment in future programmes to improve facilities for kitchens and dining in some schools. Consideration will be given to bids for any additional notional resources made available. Any further extension of the free school meals policy at national level would have further capital implications.

- 9.12 **Maintenance** - The County Council recognises the important contribution that maintenance services can make in ensuring that children and young people have access to high quality learning environments and also to their safeguarding. The total maintenance backlog in schools across the County currently exceeds £30 million and it is therefore important that investment continues to be made in maintaining the fabric of buildings.

Although most responsibilities in respect of the maintenance of school buildings have been devolved to schools through successive LMS delegations the County Council has been, and will continue to be, proactive in the provision of support to schools in exercising these responsibilities. As noted earlier, MASS (the Maintenance and Servicing Scheme) has been developed for revenue funded maintenance. MASS has replaced the previous PREMISES scheme with the objective of simplifying the services that are offered to schools and providing schools with greater choice and flexibility about the amount of maintenance services that they subscribe to.

In addition to the revenue funded MASS for responsive and preventative maintenance, there is also the capital maintenance programme to ensure schools needs are met on a strategically planned basis. The condition survey programme (each school is surveyed every five years and reviewed annually) has proved to be beneficial and is used as the basis for deciding works carried out via the capital maintenance programme. Structures and systems identified in poor condition give an indication of higher running costs and an emphasis on prioritising those maintenance items enables capital expenditure to reduce revenue expenditure. The regular condition surveys help to inform investment priorities for the delivery of capital maintenance and will not be replaced by the

national Property Data Survey which looks at higher level condition in order to inform government capital allocations.

Historically, schools were asked to contribute 25% of the cost of their capital maintenance projects from their (much higher) devolved capital allocations. The much lower values of DFC will continue to impact on the level of funding required to support the Capital Maintenance Programme.

The reality of the 25% DFC arrangements was that larger value jobs were not generally being addressed and therefore, since 2011 (when the arrangements changed) we have had to address a backlog of significant jobs. More recently, a flexible approach has been adopted whereby schools which have projects in the capital maintenance programme are asked to make the largest contribution possible, taking account of other commitments. This arrangement takes into account their much lower devolved resources and the fact that while some schools still have large DFC balances others are running deficits. It is proposed to continue with this flexible arrangement and on this basis a significant priority for capital investment will be a contribution to the Capital Maintenance Programme.

This flexible approach enables a number of larger value projects at some schools with deficits and in other cases schools being asked to fully fund maintenance projects that have been identified as high priority rather than other projects they might have hoped to progress. It ensures funding is maximised towards essential condition items.

The capital maintenance programme will need to contain a smaller number of larger value projects than in previous years. This is because there are a growing number of schools with maintenance backlogs requiring significant investment.

Sometimes large scale works are required which are over and above the capital maintenance programme. For example, a number of schools have suffered significant structural issues and provision for major structural work may need to be a future capital priority

- 9.13 **Invest to Save** – Short term investment will be required in order to meet longer term and on-going service savings requirements. For example, a review of Children’s Social Care accommodation is being undertaken which may require capital investment in order to release longer term revenue savings and improve service delivery.

CYPS will contribute to the Council’s 2020 savings programme and capital investment may be required to achieve the revenue savings. The 2020 programme has an emphasis on working with communities to create stronger communities and on developing the ability of communities to support themselves to a greater degree than they already do. The 2020 vision of stronger and more vibrant communities involves a core focus for the Council, at least initially, of social care, libraries, transport and youth provision. Communities will be encouraged and facilitated to create hubs rather than stand alone services, with shared volunteers and a common back office, and schools may become central to this, particularly by working in partnership with libraries. Further opportunities for increased co-location of service will need to be advanced to extract greater efficiencies from services which may well require an element of capital to ‘invest to save’.

10 HOW THE PROJECTS ARE DELIVERED

10.1 County Council Capital Projects – Brief Development and Feasibility

All significant projects in the Council's Capital Plan are the subject of a written brief agreed in consultation with the school or service user. This ensures a consistent approach and that school specific needs are properly addressed.

For County Council funded capital projects Strategic Planning in CYPS will usually act as the Lead Client although all projects will be discussed and agreed at design stage with the school.

All capital schemes are subject to the development of a feasibility study with Jacobs UK, and proceed in line with the County Council's gateway procurement processes and checked on the RIBA plan of work. Along with design, the feasibility study also looks at programming and assesses budget implications.

10.2 County Council Capital Projects – Design, Procurement, Tendering and Construction

The Design Development process and the arrangements for the tendering of County Council projects are currently handled by Jacobs UK. The Design Development process for all projects generally follows the RIBA plan of work and regular cost checks are carried out to ensure that the developing estimated costs are in line with the approved budget.

Acting on behalf of the Council in its role as the "deliverer" of all Council projects, the Investments and Delivery team within Corporate Property Service will oversee the on-site works of schemes and ensure the quality standards the Council expects for developments are upheld by contractors.

The Council does not operate a Direct Works Organisation therefore all work is undertaken by private sector contractors, who have been carefully scrutinised before being placed on a framework. For projects beneath a £250k threshold, contractors on the framework are awarded schemes in their geographical areas. All projects above this threshold are exposed to competitive tender in accordance with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and where appropriate expert procurement advice is provided.

In March 2016 the Jacobs contract reaches its end point. Proposals for new arrangements from April 2016 are being developed and will be subject to procurement during 2014/15. Arrangements will be made to ensure the continuity of projects during this period.

10.3 School Funded Projects

Guidance to schools organising projects themselves is contained in the booklet "Devolved Capital Building Projects". This, together with the Project Proposal Form, seeks to ensure that proper standards are followed, that Strategic Planning is notified well ahead of any implementation date and that the project is consistent with an overall vision of accommodation development requirements.

Schools are allowed to carry out their own developments using their own choice of consultants and contractors subject to following the LMS Contract Procedure

Rules and Directorate procedures. Schools are advised that when they are running their own project they should take early advice on all aspects of the project, and ensure that timescales and budget implications are considered carefully.

11 VERSION

This document replaces:-

- The AMP Local Policy Statement July 2001
- Guide to Schools Capital 2003
- The AMP Statement of Priorities 2003
- The AMP Local Policy Statement 2006

which have now been removed from the red bag system for schools.

12 REVIEW

The date for a review of this LPS is December 2017.

MA
November 2014

NOTES

1. NYCC's *Corporate Objectives* aim to: ensure good access for all; help people to live in safe communities; help all children and young people to develop their full potential; promote a flourishing economy; maintain and enhance our environment and heritage; and improve health and wellbeing and give people effective support when they need it. These *Corporate Objectives* are underpinned by the *Corporate Values*.
2. *Young and Yorkshire: The Children and Young People's Plan 2014-17* sets out a strategy for CYPS for the next 3 years. *Young and Yorkshire* replaces the strategy set out in the *Children and Young People's Plan 2011-14*, which was based on the five statutory outcomes enshrined in the Children Act 2004 of Being Healthy, Staying Safe, Enjoying and Achieving, Making a Positive Contribution and Achieving Economic Well Being.
3. As outlined in *Young and Yorkshire, The Children and Young People's Plan 2014-17* and also in North Yorkshire's *14-19 Education and Skills Position Statement*.
4. The AMP reveals an interesting statistic regarding the age of North Yorkshire schools and the percentage of school building stock now exceeding its design life. While the national average for schools constructed pre 1919 is only 14%, 35% of our schools were constructed pre 1919. In relation to the national average, therefore, a greater proportion of our school building stock now exceeds its design life.
5. There are many other Building Bulletins e.g. Environmental Issues and Acoustics, Ventilation, Fire Safety, Special Educational Needs, etc. For all County projects, the designer's brief will contain reference to relevant guidance on standards.

The DfE have published Exemplar Designs for both secondary and primary schools which were concepts and ideas of schools for the future. These were intended as inspiration and ideas for designers. In practice few of the exemplar designs were used nationally and these exemplars have been superseded by a set of standardised designs.

Issues of sustainability have assumed increased importance. Guidance has been published on Green Schools. There is an assessment method (BREEAM) which has been devised for use on school projects and which was updated in 2008. The Building Research Establishment's Environmental Assessment Method has been used since the 1990's on other types of developments. Some District Councils have introduced a requirement for BREEAM Very Good ratings as part of their planning policies.

- 6 These anticipated strategic priorities are also subject to changes in government priorities on schools capital. For example, the James Review considered the regulations on school design and the management of funding and recommended a more centralised management of capital funding and projects. The government's intended response to some of the more revolutionary proposals in the James Review on Schools Capital is still unclear. However, if project funding and management were to become more centralised then our future priorities for capital planning would need a significant revision.