

**LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES**

**CABINET**

**DATE:** 9 OCTOBER 2006

**REPORT OF:** CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES AND EDUCATION  
DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR RESOURCES

**LEAD OFFICER:** INTERIM DIVISIONAL MANAGER, PLANNING AND RESOURCES

**SUBJECT:** BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE ONE-SCHOOL PATHFINDER – TEDDINGTON SCHOOL

**WARDS:** TEDDINGTON

**KEY DECISION?:** YES

**IF YES, IN FORWARD PLAN?:** YES

For general release

**1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

1.1 The report provides an update on the Building Schools for the Future ("BSF") One-School Pathfinder project at Teddington School since the last Cabinet Report on 30 May 2006 agenda items 14 and 15.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1.2 The report provides an update on the Building Schools for the Future ("BSF") One-School Pathfinder project at Teddington School since the last Cabinet Report on 30 May 2006 agenda items 14 and 15. This report notes the decision of the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Resources and the Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Education to approve the appointment of the Building Design Partnership ("BDP") as the design team for the project. The report also requests approval for expenditure on the fees for the post-16 accommodation at Teddington School prior to the outcome of the 'open competition' process run by the Learning and Skills Council.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Members are asked:**

**2.1 To note progress to date.**

Agenda Item No.

**15**

- 2.2 To note the decision of the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Resources and the Cabinet Member for Children’s Services and Education to approve the appointment of The Building Design Partnership as the Design Team as delegated by Cabinet on 30 May 2006.**
- 2.3 To approve expenditure on the fees for the post-16 accommodation at Teddington School prior to the outcome of ‘open competition’ process run by the Learning and Skills Council.**

### **3. DETAIL**

#### **3.1 Design Team appointment**

Following the Cabinet report approval for the procurement process of the Design Team, fifty-two responses were received to the published OJEU notice. A short-listing process was undertaken resulting in six companies to move through to the next stage. These companies attended a half day session held at Teddington School on 5 July, providing presentations from the school and officers, a question and answer session and a tour of the school site. The potential Design Teams had until 9 August to respond to the Consultants’ Brief issued on 4 July 2006. As outlined in agenda item 14 of the Cabinet Report 30 May 2006, the tenders were judged on both quality and price using pre-determined criteria and a scoring system. The Quality scores were based on an assessment of the formal submission supplemented by an interview. The interview day was held on 22 August 2006. The panel, including school representatives, officers and other appointed consultants, recommended The Building Design Partnership (“BDP”) for appointment as the design team.

#### **3.2 Other appointed consultants**

3.2.1 Fiona Duggan, FID Ltd., has been assigned by the DfES as the CAFE Enabler (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment). Mr J Chapman, R.James Chapman Architect, has been appointed to the role of Client Design Advisor.

3.2.2 Mr M Riches has been appointed as the Interim Project Manager through Currie and Brown, as approved by Cabinet on 30 May 2006 agenda item 15.

3.2.3 Mr C Grasby, Ryder HKS International, has been appointed to the role of Design Quality Indicator (DQI) for Schools Facilitator to provide the relevant stages at Briefing, Early-Design, Late-Design, Ready for Occupation and In-Use stages of the project.

3.2.4 The first session took place on the 18 July 2006 with school representatives including staff, governors and pupils present, sports centre representatives and other officers. The process provides a way of collecting views from respondents about a building’s functionality, build quality and impact, and aims to achieve design excellence. The output from the first session was provided to the potential design teams to inform them prior to their tender submissions.

#### **3.3 Site works**

Further to earlier site investigations undertaken, arrangements have been made to carry out topographical and measured surveys of the school site.

#### 3.4 Learning and Skills Council

The Learning and Skills Council (LSC) published a 'statement of need' on the 24 August that outlines the requirement for 430 post-16 places over two years within the Richmond borough. The LSC has a new process for running an 'open competition' for post-16 places that would result in a final decision at the end of March 2007. It is anticipated that a proposal will be submitted by a consortium of schools with Richmond upon Thames College that would include post-16 provision at Teddington School. The LSC timetable does not fit comfortably with the design process for Teddington School. A decision is required to proceed with the design process to include post-16 provision that could subsequently be excluded should the outcome of the competition be unsuccessful. Members are asked to approve expenditure on fees for Post 16 accommodation at Teddington School pending the outcome of the Post 16 competition in March 2007. The Council needs to consider the risk attached to fees expended in the design of post-16 accommodation that may not be included at a later date.

#### 3.5 Sustainable School demonstration status

The Council submitted a bid for Teddington School for demonstration status as a sustainable school but unfortunately this was unsuccessful. It would have provided the funding necessary to meet the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) rating of 'excellent'. As the bid was unsuccessful the lower level of funding provided by the DfES will result in a lower rating but could achieve a BREEAM rating of 'very good'. Information based on the three local authorities that were awarded the sustainable school status indicates that an additional £1.5 - £2 million would be needed to move from 'very good' to 'excellent'.

The BREEAM rating is determined by a scoring system across a range of areas, including construction processes, building efficiency, environmental impacts, health and wellbeing, energy, transport, etc. The table below shows the minimum score required for each rating.

Rating	Minimum score required
PASS	25
GOOD	40
VERY GOOD	55
EXCELLENT	70

#### 3.6 Communication/consultation

The Council is developing the structure for communicating with the wider community to provide updates on the Teddington School project. Consultation will be included at appropriate stages of the project. A web page has been set up as a main reference point for interested parties.

### 4. **CONSULTATION**

4.1 None required other than as set out in the report.

### 5 **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 The extra cost of design fees to include post-16 provision has been estimated at £150,000 for the early design stage. The Council needs to ensure that the design process is not delayed whilst waiting for the outcome of the “open competition” for post-16 provision in March 2007. To delay on the design stage would mean that the Council would not meet the DfES deadline for the new building to be open for September 2009.

## **6. POLICY IMPLICATIONS/CONSIDERATIONS**

- 6.1 The Building Schools for the Future One-School Pathfinder is an opportunity to provide a secondary school for the twenty-first century that will support the aims of the Council’s vision for excellence and provide a superb resource for students, staff and the community. This will also contribute to the Council’s aims outlined in the Community Plan to provide sufficient high quality school places. It will contribute significantly to the achievement of a wide range of targets for Education and Children’s Services within the “Every Child Matters” framework.
- 6.2 The investment in the feasibility design is both relevant and essential to the wider agenda for raising standards and participation in the 14-19 phase of education. The requirement for schools and colleges to develop personalised learning and flexible curriculum pathways for students will eradicate the current constraints imposed by the age of the learner. The Post 16 feasibility will provide insight into the development of Teddington as a school for the future, either part of the current competition for Post 16 or in preparation for the next stage of development

## **7. RISK ASSESSMENT**

A risk assessment schedule has been produced and is available from the Assistant Director of Environment.

## **8. EQUALITY IMPACT/CONSIDERATIONS**

The Building Schools for the Future One-School Pathfinder is an opportunity to provide a secondary school for the twenty-first century which will support the raising of standards and high quality education, with improved accessibility for the whole community.

## **9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no legal implications arising specifically from any of the matters referred to in this report although of course suitable contracts will be required for the various appointments of consultants and for the construction contracts in due course.

## **10. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:**

Member decision 6 September 2006  
Cabinet Report 30 May 2006

Sustainable school demonstration status submission to the DfES 5 May 2006  
Cabinet Report 24 April 2006  
Second stage submission to the DfES 31 March 2006  
Rationale submission to the DfES 18 January 2006  
Cabinet Report 16 January 2006  
Cabinet Report 5 December 2006  
Education & Culture Overview & Scrutiny Report 1 December 2005

## **11. CONTACTS**

Councillor Eady, Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Education;  
email: [cllr.meady@richmond.gov.uk](mailto:cllr.meady@richmond.gov.uk)

Councillor Knight, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Resources, email:  
[cllr.sknight@richmond.gov.uk](mailto:cllr.sknight@richmond.gov.uk)

Paul Bettles, Interim Divisional Manager, Planning and Resources, 020 8891  
7562  
Email: [p.bettles@richmond.gov.uk](mailto:p.bettles@richmond.gov.uk)