



GUERNSEY STATES

LE MARE DE CARTERET SCHOOLS PROJECT

## PROJECT VALUE REVIEW

by Alan Brown of IID Architects

on behalf of the Guernsey States Departments of Treasury and Resources and Education

# FINAL REPORT

10<sup>th</sup> December 2015

## Contents

- 1.0 Terms of Reference
- 2.0 Introduction
- 3.0 Case for Development/Replacement
- 4.0 Outline Project Brief
- 5.0 Proposed Development Strategy
- 6.0 Educational Vision/Objectives
- 7.0 Community Vision/Objectives
- 8.0 Sports Vision/Objectives
- 9.0 Consultations
- 10.0 Area Analysis and Comparisons
- 11.0 Sustainability
- 12.0 Future Expansion/Change
- 13.0 External Areas
- 14.0 Design Language and Materials
- 15.0 Construction Phasing
- 16.0 Procurement and Programme
- 17.0 Costs
- 18.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

Appendix 1 – Figures

Appendix 2 – Comparative Area Analysis

Appendix 3 – Pupil Projection Models

Appendix 4 – G&T's Value for Money Review dated 28<sup>th</sup> November 2015

## 1.0 Terms of Reference :

This Review has been commissioned by both the Departments of T&R and Education following the States' resolution dated May 2015 and the agreed 'Way Forward' set out in the summary of the meeting between T&R and Education on 29<sup>th</sup> June 2015. (See extracts below for reference)

### ***Extract from States' Resolution***

*To direct the Treasury and Resources and Education Departments, following the independent review in Proposition 3 to undertake a formal value management exercise involving independent and appropriately qualified facilitators and the project team in order to ensure that the Project meets the recommended and approved scale, scope and specification and represents best value to the States*

### ***Extract from 'Agreed Way Forward'***

1) Both Departments would jointly agree upon and appoint an expert(s) who would meet the Project Team (specifically the Architects - Design Engine) as soon as possible to consider and critically challenge and evaluate the spatial design parameters that underpin the current design which will be undertaken as part of the project assurance process.

4) That the project assurance referred to above, would effectively operate as a further element of the gateway review which would challenge the existing design, scale and scope (including the '12.7%' uplift) of the High School facilities in a constructive manner. This would also ensure that any decisions made going forward could be robustly supported, to the benefit of both Departments.

Based on these terms of reference for this further review of the Le Mare de Carteret Schools project, I have therefore interrogated the design proposals and project background and in my capacity as an experienced Architect and RIBA Client Adviser critically but constructively commented on my findings. As a joint commission its purpose was also to facilitate a positive collaboration between both departments in order to reach a shared understanding as to the project's investment value against the backdrop of the States' agreed objectives of opening the new schools and associated facilities no later than September 2018.

This report is the conclusion of a process undertaken since July 2015 with T&R and Education Departments and involving the project design team and building users. It has been based on the latest information provided by the States' Education Department and the Project Design Team at the end of September, together with interviews and workshops.

For reference figures 1-14 provide an overview of the project summarising the design principles using drawings provided by the Architects Design Engine. These may vary in areas of detail from the latest versions of the design which is ongoing in order to meet the programme, but are sufficient to explain the essential principles of the proposals which this review seeks to summarise and evaluate.

*NB : Issues relating to Building Regulations, CDM and other statutory compliance requirements are adequately covered through statutory processes and are therefore not specifically addressed in this review.*

## **2.0 Introduction :**

### **2.1 Background :**

In mid 2014 the LMDC Schools project was paused just before the completion of the Developed Design Stage (ie RIBA Stage 3 – pre-planning). Until then the new facilities were due to open in September 2017.

The case for replacement of both the high school and primary school and the provision of new community and sports facilities had been supported by The States because the existing 1960's buildings at LMDC are well past their life expectancy and deemed not fit for contemporary education. This site was the next phase in the replacement schools programme following re-development Les Beaucamps HS which opened in 2012 (main School) with the sports hall following in 2014.

The project paused due to questions as to the 'value' of the proposed investment at LMDC which in 2014 represented just over £60m total project cost. Despite a series of reviews (the last in February 2015) a continuing difference of view between the States' Departments of Education and T&R, remained unresolved in the summer of 2015 when I was jointly appointed by T&R and Education as an independent consultant. My task, as noted above, was to constructively work with both departments to resolve this difference by facilitating a shared understanding as to the investment value of the LMDC project. But also it was to navigate a way forward which would meet the States' agreed objectives of opening the new schools and associated facilities no later than September 2018.

As a result of the project pause in 2014, the original programme for opening the new schools in September 2017 was put back 12 months to September 2018 at the latest. As already noted this opening target is an underlying priority which it is understood, has been agreed by The States. In order to meet this programme design work has had to continue in parallel with this review and approval for this additional work was granted by the Project and Education Boards and supported by T&R following the May 2015 States' Report.

Prior to this current review there have been a series of detailed Gateway Reviews as the project has progressed together with other supplementary reviews/reports and as required by the

'Agreed Way Forward', this review seeks to build on the previous work, effectively providing a further element of constructive Gateway Review.

To assist with achieving a shared understanding of the project by both Departments this review has specifically provided a summarised narrative as to the nature of the project and the objectives it sought to meet. My commentary and recommendations provide a professional view as to whether the objectives are reasonable, whether the proposals meet the objectives and whether given the circumstances of the project, it offers genuine investment value.

In addition, and as noted in the Education Department's letter dated April 2015, a strategic and far reaching review of the States' Education system is currently being undertaken. The public consultation launched in October 2015 has recently closed and the outcome of the Strategic Review should be known in March 2016 when The States are due to consider a report from Education Department. The outcome will affect only the high school element of the project but could result in the pupil capacity for this being either 600 (5FE) or 960(8FE). To avoid delays awaiting the outcome of this review, which would inevitably threaten a 2018 opening, the original design has been modified so that it can accommodate being built for either 600 or 960 pupils. Addressing this key factor has of necessity had to be incorporated into this review process.

At a Review Group Workshop at the end of July therefore, two options for the increase in HS pupil places from the original 600 to 960 were considered. Based on the recommendation from this workshop (which included representatives from both T&R and Education) a decision was taken by The Project and Education Boards in August 2015 to pursue the option which most effectively met the requirements for both cohort sizes without threatening the overall project programme. This agreed option is a HS which has been redesigned for 960 and which can be built in either two phases or as a single phase to best suit the outcome of the Strategic Review in March 2016. The option for a simple expansion of the original design for 600 pupils was for a variety of reasons not considered appropriate or viable by the Review Group.

This review has therefore, only focussed on this preferred HS option (Options B1 and B2 – see below) for which designs are currently continuing to be developed.

The Options considered were :

- A0 : The original 600 place High School design (Refer to the Stage 3 Report dated Feb 2014) as considered by the various review groups including a bridge access at first floor.. (Discounted due to less than optimum options for expansion and due to costs associated with first floor bridge access).
- A1 : 600 place HS with rationalised design excluding the first floor access bridge link and better anticipating future expansion. (Discounted due to less than optimum relationship between the extension and main body of the school (as noted in A2 below).
- A2 : 960 place HS assuming a 2 storey extension for the additional accommodation. (Discounted as for A1 and due to planners concerns about excessive building massing)
- B1 : 600 place HS based on a reworked and rationalised version of the original design to be built as a first phase of a 960 place HS – see Option B2 below. (Preferred Option allowing greater future flexibility to respond to the Strategic Review and positively supported by Environment Department).
- B2 : 960 place HS built either in one or two phases to respond to the outcome of the Strategic Review. (Preferred Option as for B1).

*NB. In the continuing development of Options B1 and B2 a number of other design concerns (raised in various previous reviews and also during this review) are being addressed wherever possible in order to reduce costs, improve functionality and ensure greater future flexibility.*

## **2.2 Current status of the project :**

The project is now part way through Technical Design (RIBA Stage 4 – previously Stage E) based on Options B1 and B2 on the basis that the high school element can be built in either one or two stages to suit the outcome of the Strategic Review.

To meet the programme for delivery, funding was agreed for design work based on the development of Options B1 and B2 to progress during this review process. The Developed Design (RIBA Stage 3 - previously Stage D) which was nearing completion in October has now continued into Technical Design with the primary school currently being more advanced than the high school and sports centre.

The procurement process remains a 2 stage tender for a Design and Build Contract for which Stage 1 tenders were received before the process was paused. On the basis of the Stage 1 tenders two contractors have been selected to progress the Stage 2 tenders, and they are awaiting the issue of the Technical Design and Employer's Requirements at the end of January 2016. The Technical Design for the primary school was due for completion at the end of November, with the high school and sports centre together with ancillary areas following in early January 2016.

Subject to agreement to proceed, a planning application will be submitted at the end of January 2016 in parallel with the preparation of the second stage tenders, but sufficiently in advance of anticipated site commencement in summer 2016 to ensure a determination before construction work commences.

Consultations with the Environment Department have been ongoing and the proposed designs for the revised 960 pupil option have thus far been positively received. Indeed planning officer's concerns about the form of the proposed expansion of the original 600 pupil scheme were a prime consideration in not opting for this approach. An initial Environmental Impact Assessment submission has been submitted in advance of the actual planning application and a response to this is anticipated shortly.

Consultation with key stakeholders have been ongoing throughout the project process including more recently the revised designs for the 960 pupil HS option which has been positively received by the staff community of both Schools, albeit with the continuing need for refinement of the designs to meet the outcome of consultations. In-depth consultations with staff from both schools have been undertaken by Education Department during September and October and further refinements to the design have resulted aimed at improving the overall functionality and to better reflect the aspirations of the schools.

As part of the recent design review most of the design elements of the previous 2014 scheme have been reworked to some extent albeit within the framework of the original concept. This reworking addressed both the revised brief as well as some areas of concern previously raised regarding project value. This process of refinement is continuing as part of the design development process.

## **3.0 Case for Development/Replacement :**

The existing system-built schools were both built in the 1960's and are now beyond their reasonable life expectancy. As with similar schools of a similar era, on both Guernsey and the mainland, in their current state they are no longer suited for contemporary education. As they are not considered capable of being economically refurbished/remodelled to meet current and anticipated future needs, replacement of both schools to create new purpose built co-located schools with enhanced community facilities was the States' agreed development option.

Following on from the replacement schools at St Sampson HS and Les Beaucamps HS, the LMDC Schools have been identified as the next high priority for replacement, the specific

socio/economic needs of some areas of the catchment area being a specific consideration. Hence the current deadline set by the States for the new facility to open no later than September 2018.

In the context of the Strategic Education Review the LMDC site has also been identified as one of the most suitable site for significant future expansion and redevelopment.

#### 4.0 Outline Project Brief

The basic project brief is for the provision of the following facilities as an integrated and coherent development on a single site and providing :

- A new High School built for either a 960(8FE) or 600 (5FE) pupil facility to suit the outcome of the Strategic Review.
- A new 420 pupil (2FE) Primary School with a linked but separately operated 32 place Nursery.
- Relocation of the Communication and Autism Services base (CAS) including dedicated but linked spaces for primary and secondary students easily accessible from and linking between the two main schools and serving both the LMDC schools as well as other island schools.
- A community Sports Centre used by the schools with enhanced facilities to meet the wider community needs and specifically for regional netball, basketball and volleyball with provision for up to 200-300 spectators for regular events and 500 spectators for periodic larger scale sporting events. This facility to is also be adaptable as a venue suitable for hosting occasional large scale events – eg concerts etc.
- A Community Base for use by the local community including families and older generation easily accessible from the public domain.
- Facilities which offer a seamless transition between primary and secondary schools and which celebrate the opportunities of co-location and shared community use.
- An appropriately contemporary design which meets the educational/functional requirements of the users and builds on the feedback from previous Guernsey School projects, specifically from the more recent developments at St Sampson and Les Beaucamps.
- A development which allows the existing schools to continue in operation with minimum adverse impact on the current cohorts.
- A development which takes account of and celebrates its sensitive setting and specifically the proximity to the coast.
- A procurement approach which effectively engages and uses on-island resources and benefits the local economy.

The detailed project brief has been based on the comprehensive Generic Brief provided by Education Department with the detail site-specific project briefs being developed through an iterative process between Education Department, other commissioning groups and the Design Team, with engagement and input from key stakeholders as the process has developed. As a result of this incremental approach I believe the underlying narrative may have been lost thereby contributing to the current impasse. Hence the need to summarise and restate the key headlines of the design narrative in this review.

#### 5.0 Proposed Site Development Strategy: Ref Figs 1&2.

Figure 1 shows the existing site and figure 2 illustrates the proposed development Strategy using DE's drawing annotated to show the key principles. The design proposes the following key features in response to the project brief noted above:

- A series of separate but connected buildings located on an area of site which avoids the existing buildings and which, to meet Environment Department's requirements and to respect the sensitive nature of the site, does not encroach beyond the existing tree line to the west.
- A development which celebrates and enhances the existing features of the site including the canal and pond at its heart, other landscape features and views towards the coast.

- A development which uses the existing canal and pond as a shared resource for both schools and community creating a unique focus at the heart of the development.
- A central semi-public spine off which all facilities are accessed and which crosses the canal using two bridges (one existing and one new).
- Reconfigured vehicle entrance and exit routes including a new exit-only route for all traffic using the new northern road to alleviate pressure and to improve safety at drop-off and collection times. Visitor and staff parking and main vehicle drop-off/collection areas are located at the heart of the site adjacent to the semi-public spine.
- The formation of a new flood defence bund to benefit both the schools and the immediate area, in line with current coastal defence strategy.
- A mix of building heights – 1&2 storeys for PS, single storey for CAS, 2 and 3 storeys for HS and 2 storeys for sports centre with the higher buildings in the heart of the site.
- The main service area to be hidden by the flood bund and conveniently accessible from the northern approach road.
- Community facilities (sports and community rooms) located so as to be readily accessible from the semi-public domain including the main spine and the existing public footpaths alongside the canal and along the eastern boundary.
- A Specialist Communication and Autism Unit (CAS) shared by and located between the two main schools, with easy access for peripatetic staff, off site pupils and from each school.
- Nursery and Primary School to be at the front of the site (closest to the main site entrance) leading onto the main High School and Sports Centre beyond and providing a progression for younger to older users running east to west.

**6.0 Educational Vision/Objectives** *The following is only intended as a headline summary of broad objectives based on evidence from Education Department and the Head Teachers of the respective Schools and discussions with Leisure Services.*

### 6.1 Overall

- To maximise the benefits of co-location by ensuring a seamless transition and progression between schools from Nursery through to High School and beyond.
- To provide a welcoming and inviting environment for parents and the wider community whilst ensuring an appropriately secure site.
- To provide an accessible local resource for the school community and wider island use.

### 6.2 Nursery :

- To provide a separate privately operated nursery loosely linked to the Primary School to allow some overlap and shared use of facilities.
- Arising for the requirement for an independently operated Nursery (as elsewhere on the island) the usual more direct connection between the Nursery and Reception Class areas (Foundation Stage) was not a requirement of the original brief. The principles of nursery provision are however, currently under review and it is understood that the nursery may ultimately revert to being operated by the school for which the proposed relationship between nursery and reception may not be ideally suited.

### 6.3 Primary School

- To provide a welcoming child-centred facility with flexible learning spaces to allow personalised and flexible teaching and learning approaches.
- Class clusters to be supported with appropriate resource areas, break-out spaces and smaller group rooms.
- Direct links to external learning areas for all classes.
- Teaching and learning areas to be ICT rich with a wide range of media options.
- Transition from year 6 into years 7 and 8 to be as smooth and seamless as possible.
- A welcoming and accessible approach to encourage engagement with and involvement of parents which is a high priority.
- To celebrate the ongoing creative work of pupils through extensive display opportunities.

#### **6.4 High School**

- To create a more adult environment to encourage positive behaviour whilst also providing a nurtured transition for year 7 and 8 pupils arriving from primary school - A seamless transition’.
- To provide a wide and flexible curriculum offer with well-resourced Learning Support.
- To celebrate the ongoing creative work of pupils through extensive display opportunities.
- To encourage engagement of parents and the wider community in the school.
- To encourage links with local businesses.

#### **6.5 Communication and Autism Service Unit (CAS):**

- To relocate an existing provision from two other schools with cramped accommodation to provide a new specialist facility for 18 pupils shared and collaboratively operated by both LMDC schools.
- To provide a satellite base for outreach services.
- To have separate but linked spaces for each school.

#### **7.0 Community Vision/Objectives :**

- To provide an accessible Community Base for small groups together with appropriate shared use of the wider site facilities in order to specifically support families and the elderly.
- To provide convenient access to the community facilities direct from the public domain also allowing a positive and connection to the Cobo local centre to encouraging sustained and developing use of the facilities by the local community.
- NB It is understood that the original need for the community base is currently under review to ensure this facility does not duplicate other local provisions.

#### **8.0 Sports Vision/Objectives :**

- To provide high quality sports facilities for the schools, the wider community and the wider island.
- To provide indoor facilities for netball, volleyball and basketball which are suitable for local and regional competitions not currently available elsewhere on the island. The space requirements for netball specifically, together with the space for up to 500 spectators are a specific driver for the size of the main hall.

It was noted by Leisure Services that the opportunity which this development presents, being the last replacement secondary school project on the island for the foreseeable future, is probably the last opportunity for Education and Leisure Services to collaborate to achieve the enhanced sports provision not otherwise affordable.

#### **9.0 Consultations :**

- For a scheme of this ambition the process of consultation is inevitably complex involving multiple stakeholders.
- From the users’ perspective the process to date appears to have engaged the Education Department and ED’s specialist advisors including the CAS, the two Schools (Leadership Teams and Staff), Leisure Services and with principal sports bodies together with some wider community engagement.
- Despite the difficulties over the summer period the schools have been consulted and had engagement workshops on the latest proposals the outcomes of which have where possible, been incorporated into the designs. This process has continued through the completion of Developed Design and into Technical Design involving the leadership teams and staff of both Schools.
- The extent to which student and parents have been involved and the extent of community engagement relating to the School design appears to have been more limited, and this should ideally be addressed before the design has progressed too much further.

- Consultations with the planning authority (Environment Department) and other statutory agencies have been ongoing as the design proposals have been developed including more recently detailed pre-application discussions regarding Options B1&2.
- Engagement with the various key sports bodies (ie netball, volley ball and basketball as well as cricket) occurred during 2013 and 2014 during the early stages of project development. The Sports Commissioners have also been consulted in September 2015 on the revised B1 and B2 proposals and they are understood to have confirmed their continued support for the proposals and for the original strategic objectives for the key sports. The principal sporting bodies for netball, volleyball and basketball have also confirmed their joint commitment to work together and with the schools to ensure the facilities are used effectively with minimum void periods.

## 10.0 Area Analysis and Comparisons :

### 10.1 Designed Areas

The current designed areas for the project are as noted below:

Option B1 600 pupils	Gross Internal Floor Area m <sup>2</sup>
High School	6575
Excess area in anticipation of increase to 960	182
Community Room	147
Sports Centre	2,184
CAS	200
Primary School	2560
Nursery	116
<b>TOTAL GIA for Option B2</b>	<b>11,964</b>
Option B2 960 pupils	Gross Internal Floor Area m <sup>2</sup>
High School	8,262
Community Room	147
Sports Centre	2,184
CAS	200
Primary School	2560
Nursery	116
<b>TOTAL GIA for Option B1</b>	<b>13,470</b>

### 10.2 Introduction

One of the key issues in the debate surrounding this project has been the overall target areas specifically for the two main schools in the relation to the recommended areas in Building Bulletins 98 (secondary schools) and 99 (primary schools) which have historically been used as a benchmark.

The following section explores and comments on the proposed areas for the various elements of the project. For the high school and primary school it specifically looks at the relationship between the recommendations of BB98 and BB99 and the gross internal floor areas (GIAs) proposed for the new schools at LMDC taking account of Guernsey's particular circumstances.

Before the demise of the 'Building Schools for the Future Programme' BB98 and BB99 published by DfES, provided a minimum standard for state secondary and primary schools. These have now been superseded by BB103 which is significantly more restrictive in terms of recommended areas reflecting the constraints of the UK's current building programmes including the Priority School Building Programme.

Guernsey has however, always sought to provide a very different and more pastorally supportive educational experience hence the much lower class sizes of 20-24 and the notional 16% uplift on GIA for high schools compared to the building bulletins agreed following a T&R



Independent Review in 2005. The reasons for this adjustment are outlined in the Education Department's letter dated April 2015 and are also summarised below.

The educational brief for the schools are also Guernsey specific reflecting the teaching styles, culture and skill-set of the Island. The scale of accommodation has therefore, been based on a provision which reflects the aspiration for a less pressured educational environment as well as the specific curriculum needs and emphasis of Guernsey.

For comparison purposes this approach to class sizes is far more comparable with UK independent schools and the Guernsey Colleges than the 30 per class standard upon which the recommendations of BB98 and BB99 for State Schools in UK are based.

In the context of this educational aspiration as well as the requirement for reasonable consistency across the school estate, the comparison with UK standards is therefore, not direct. There are various key areas of difference which impact on the target areas being above that set out in BB98 and BB99 based on pupil numbers only. For the high school specifically these include :

- A max 600 pupil high school in England is likely to be a 4 form entry (4FE) whereas in Guernsey it will be 5FE.
- A max 960 pupil high school in Guernsey would be 8FE whereas in England an 8FE school would cater for up to 1200 students.
- The average Guernsey class size at 11-16 is 24 with a maximum class size 30.
- For 11-16 the maximum student teacher ratio is 1:15 with LMDCHS currently just above 1:12. This enables a broad range of options at Key Stage 4 and where necessary increased number of teaching groups at Key Stage 3 and hence more teaching spaces being required.
- There is a need in the LMDC secondary school for enhanced facilities for Learning Support (SEN needs) due to the profile of students and the multi-agency and community support already available to the school.
- This is also the case in the Primary School which is translated into the number of small group and breakout spaces planned and the large shared resource areas around which class bases are clustered.
- A move to an entitlement to triple Science impacts on the provision of Science facilities hence the larger number of laboratories in both options.
- The two Food/Cooking/Catering rooms proposed for the 960 pupil option are important for both Life-Skills development but also due to the progression and employment opportunities in Guernsey in this area.

Using just total pupil numbers will inevitably distort the comparison and so I believe it is more appropriate that comparisons should be made on the basis of forms of entry rather than simply pupil numbers. The supplementary report (Appendix 2) attached to this report provides a comparison with the Building Bulletins for both the Primary School and the High School and also outlines a selected comparison of individual room areas and numbers for the HS.

### **10.3 High School Areas**

Based on a comparison using Forms of Entry as the basis, the current designed GIA for the 960 pupil (8FE) high school works out at approximately 3% less than the minimum recommended for an 8FE high school in BB98 (adjusted to discount the areas for the sports facilities). It then also matches closely the range and distribution of accommodation for an 8FE school.

The designed GIA for the 600 pupil (5FE) school however, shows an excess of approximately 19% above BB98 recommendation for a 5FE school. This excludes the additional area required to anticipate the increase to 960 currently estimated at 182sqm.

By this comparison the 960 pupil Option (B1) compares significantly more favourably with BB98 than the 600 pupil Option (B2).

The proposed accommodation brief reflected in these areas has been interrogated by both the School and the Education Department and they have both confirmed they are satisfied that the accommodation being provided matches the proposed curriculum offer allowing for a 74% occupancy which is average and reasonable for curriculum analysis calculations.

Concerns have also related to whether demand would justify the places being provided and therefore, whether either option would effectively be under occupied due to a lower than anticipated demand.

The projected demand for high school places has been based on projections undertaken by The Education Department using the States' latest population projections – refer to the Pupil Projection Model in Appendix 3. Using this data and assuming a baseline sensitivity of 0% for demand and supply, various alternative projections have been run to reflect the possible outcomes of the Strategic Review, anticipating both a 600 place and 960 place provision at LMDC running from 2014 to 2028.

For Proposal A with LMDC providing 600 places, projections from 2022 – 2028 indicate class sizes of between 22 and 29 which at the upper level would indicate that some rebalancing across the schools may be required to keep classes at 24.

For Proposal B with LMDC providing 960 places, projections from 2022 – 2028 indicate class sizes of between 28 and 32 which would again indicate some rebalancing across the high schools would be required to keep classes at around 24.

Overall the projections support the proposed pupil capacity for the high school at least up to 2028. It is however, recognised that unless corrective action is taken to address the demographic shift in terms of a disproportionately ageing population on the island, there is likely to be a decline in demand from 2028/30.

Using the UK and Island independent sector as a comparator the pupil/area ratio would not suggest that the facility should lack any sense of positive atmosphere. The results of the Post Implementation Review at Les Beaucamp HS also indicate that even with the current pupil numbers being below capacity the facility has a positive atmosphere.

#### **10.4 Primary School Areas**

For the Primary School the comparison is based on a theoretical intake of 420 as a 2FE school albeit it is likely that with average class sizes of 24 the cohort will be 336. The cohort for a social priority 2FE school is also capped at 350 pupils for as long as it retains this status. So this comparison is already based on the forms of entry rather pupil numbers. As shown the designed GIA for the Primary School is approximately 15% above BB99, (ie just below the notional uplift of 16%). The area per pupil @ 6.5m<sup>2</sup> is about average for the 12 island primary schools which range between 9.3m<sup>2</sup> pp for Forest Primary School and 5.1m<sup>2</sup>pp for La Houquette PS.

As an example in comparison with independent school provisions on the mainland (as referred to earlier) the area per pupil at 6.5m<sup>2</sup> compares favourably with a number of independent Junior Schools on which I am currently working, which range between 7.3sqm and 12sqm per pupil for new build projects.

#### **10.5 Sports Centre**

The scale and provision of the sports centre and associated facilities, which is significantly larger than would be required for a High School only, has resulted from the wider community and regional sports brief as outlined above following a period of consultation with various sports bodies and community groups. Refer to section 9.0 above.

As noted the principal determinate for the size of the hall is the requirement for indoor netball plus the need to accommodate a total of approximately 500 spectators.

#### **10.6 Nursery**

The scale of the nursery provision (116sqm) for groups of 16 within the main resource/activity space has been determined by requirements of the private operator. At 3.99sqm per child this exceeds the UK statutory requirement of 2.3sqm per child.

#### **10.7 Communication and Autism Service :**

The scale of provision for the CAS unit (200sqm) has been determined from the experience of the two existing units which it will replace and which are both relatively cramped. The CAS brief and consultations with specialist staff is understood to have validated the level of provision proposed. Each resource area is approximately 55sqm in area marginally less than a GT classroom which gives ample opportunity for working with small groups with a variety of settings with withdrawal / quiet rooms immediately adjacent.

#### **10.8 Community rooms:**

The scale of accommodation for the Community Base (147sqm) is understood to have been determined from consultations with Social Services and local community groups, although the level of provision is understood to be currently under review.

### **11.0 Sustainability:**

- A fabric first approach has been adopted, with good airtightness and high insulation levels including high performance window and doors; together with a heavy weight structure for high thermal mass and maximum environmental comfort.
- Natural ventilation with cross ventilation stacks and good natural lighting are key features.
- Whilst better than UK Building Regulations performance is anticipated with appropriate renewable energy sources, details of energy conservation targets and sustainability measures are currently awaited and further clarification is therefore, required as to what specific sustainability targets are being sought. This topic should be a high priority for on-going value reviews.

### **12.0 Future Expansion / Change**

- Change is inevitable in any school, but the future is also uncertain and can never be accurately anticipated. Hence any new facility needs to be appropriately 'Future Conscious' (it can never be entirely future proof) and capable of reasonable adaptation.
- The proposals presented already anticipate the expansion of the HS from 600 to 960pupls (see figures 6-11) allowing the expansion to be added relatively simply with easy construction access from the norther access road.
- The structure of all of the buildings except the CAS Unit are framed with modular layouts and non-loadbearing partitions to allow for relatively easy internal change.
- Surface mounted services with circulation routes carrying principal services distribution anticipate and facilitate future change.
- As the project progresses the detailed design of the facilities will need to anticipate an appropriate level of future change. Further ongoing review is therefore required.

### **13.0 External areas :**

- The design of the external areas has sought to work with and enhance the existing landscape setting whilst also providing the range of external spaces appropriate to the facilities and their shared use.
- The existing pond will be developed and improved to provide a valuable shared central feature and learning resource. Both schools have responded positively to the opportunities this feature presents.
- The canal and existing bridge are retained and enhanced, with an additional bridge connecting the central spine to the HS and Sports Centre.

- A grass covered flood bund is required to the west and this will create a planted softer edge to the new development masking the lower storey and service area of the HS and providing shelter from the coastal winds.
- A 3G AW pitch and tennis courts will be provided within the secure site area, albeit the final location of the tennis courts for the 960pupil HS will depend on whether additional land adjoining the eastern boundary can be acquired which is currently under review. Ref to Figures 2 and 3.
- Secure hard play for the Primary School and High School adjoin the buildings as already noted.
- Vehicle and pedestrian access is as indicated on Figure 2.

#### 14.0 Design Language and Materials – Ref Figures 12-14

- The external design language of the buildings is deliberately simple and straightforward creating a cohesive overall campus feel which is intended to fit into the landscape without being unduly flamboyant. It is a relatively restrained but well-crafted design which responds to the Client's expressed wishes for predominantly rectilinear forms.
- The roofs generally are shallow pitched standing seam finishes with edge parapets and inboard gutters. The roofs to both school halls rise above general parapet line to locally create sufficient internal height.
- The choice of materials, (ie brick facades and bronze anodised aluminium cladding) derives from the aggressive coastal environment, lessons learned from LBHS and from consultations with planners regarding materials that will work well with the context and setting.
- Whilst these general materials run through all the buildings they are differentiated from each other through scale, proportions and colour. The primary school for instance has coloured panels behind the brick lower proportioned facades appropriate to a primary environment and distinctive from the high school. The concept for the CAS Unit as shown is of two domestic scale linked pavilions overlooking the central pond creating a secure and distinctive base for these students.
- Internally materials have been selected to be robust and durable whilst also elegant and appropriate to creating a welcoming and high quality environment.
- Glazed screens alongside the doors to all principal spaces create the sense of internal transparency required by the brief.
- The internal walls are a mix of fair faced blockwork for robustness and metal stud partitions with suspended ceilings.
- Spaces are generally naturally ventilated with cross ventilation stacks with some mechanical vent to larger spaces as required. Considerable care has been taken to balance ease of operation with environmental comfort and the refinement of this is ongoing.
- All areas are naturally lit, except for some areas of D&T and with some reduced levels to the high school IT1, which are considered acceptable for these uses.
- Furniture Fittings and Equipment proposals are in the process of being developed. These elements will significantly impact the feel and functionality of the facilities and so an adequate budget allowance for FF&E is essential at this stage of the project.

#### 15.0 Construction Phasing Overview – Ref Figure 3

- A principal driver of the development brief is the continued operation of the existing schools with minimum impact on the pupil cohort whilst development is being carried out over what will be over a 2 year construction process from start on site and longer for the 960 pupil HS option.
- The original proposals for a 600pupil HS anticipated 4 phases of development (Ref Figure 3) which has been developed and agreed with the Schools. The 960 Pupil HS option will adjust this by adding some additional phases and potentially lengthening the overall

process and details of this revised phasing will vary depending on the outcome of the Strategic Review.

- The current design with a distinct sports centre building may also offer the opportunity for early completion of the sports centre. Subject to costs this could be of significant benefit to both existing schools and help to mitigate their disruption.

**16.0 Procurement and Programme:** Refer to G&T's Procurement Strategy Report dated Feb 2014 and the latest Stage D+ Programme dated July 15 for details.

- Based on previous experience and an evaluation of the options prepared by Consultants Gardiner and Theobald (report dated Feb 2014) the preferred procurement approach is for a 2 stage D&B contract with a mix of on-island and off-island contractors. G&T's report explores in some detail the options available and records the outcomes of various market testing workshops with the contractors being considered. This approach of continuing the main contractor competition through the second stage has resulted from lessons learned on LBHS. Some of the benefits of competition were lost on LBHS with the second stage being negotiated with a single preferred contractor.
- Stage 1 tenders with a tender list of 5 contractors, were submitted in November 2014. From these 2 contractors (one on-island and one off-island) have been selected to progress the second stage tenders once the scheme has approval to progress. Both contractors were advised that the project had paused but have confirmed their continued interest to tender once the project clearance has been secured.
- During the current Stage 3&4 design development dialogue has continued with both contractors regarding the format of the tender information and constructability.
- It is understood that contractor input and innovation is also being sought as part of the second stage tender process to ensure that the pursuit of improved value is continued wherever possible throughout the balance of the design and construction stages.

The revised programme for the 960/600 pupil option currently anticipates the following

- Completion of Technical Design (RIBA Stage 4) at the end of 2015, *(NB To ensure that the level of design is sufficient to guarantee the quality of the final product under a D&B contract).*
- Submission and determination of planning application: Jan – April 2016.
- Stage 2 tender issue, preparations and negotiations: Jan – June 2016.
- States Approval: June and July 2016.
- Mobilisation: July 2016.
- Commencement on Site: August 2016.
- Completion and Handover of Schools August 2018.
- Demolitions and External works: August – end of 2018.

As already noted this will be adjusted for the either the 960 or 600 pupil option subject to the outcome of the Strategic Review.

**17.0 Costs :**

Gardiner and Theobald's Summary Report (Appendix 4) dated 28<sup>th</sup> October 2015 together with Stage 3 Cost Update dated August 2015 and School Benchmark Comparison dated July 2014 provides comparative costs and benchmarking data from which the following summary of overall project costs has been derived for the various options being considered.

Option	Estimated Total Project Cost <i>Base date 2014</i>	Estimated Total Project Cost <i>including inflation to 2018 for A0 and 2019 for others.</i>
Original Option A0	£59,820,00	£64,510,000
Discounted Option A1 for 600 HS	£60,560,000	£68,630,000
Discounted Option A2 for 960 HS	£70,150,000	£79,890,000
Preferred Option B1 for 600 HS	£60,240,000	£68,210,000
Preferred Option B1 for 960 HS	£68,960,000	£78,460,000

The G&T report also addresses unit costs for both the buildings and external works which indicate that unit rates for both buildings and external works compare favourably with other recent Guernsey Projects, and with UK schools construction once a 20% Guernsey uplift is taken into account.

On the data provided the initial project budget set at the outset has been broadly maintained and there has been no significant project drift which is frequently a criticism of major projects. Increased costs have essentially arisen due to inflation and additional fees for redesign work rather than design creep.

The above figures also indicate that the revised Option B1 for 600 pupils is slightly lesser cost (with similar specifications) than the previous equivalent A1 option and that Option B2 for 960 pupils is lower cost than the equivalent A2 Option. As might be anticipated this larger school (option B2) is significantly more efficient than the equivalent 600 pupil Option B1.

## 18.0 Conclusions and Recommendations:

**18.1** During the development of this project there have been a number of detailed gateway reviews which have until 2014 broadly validated and refined the proposals. But despite this process the project paused in mid 2014 due to lack of confidence as to its inherent value and whether the underlying brief was soundly based.

Design work was however, started again, albeit hesitantly and with cautious agreement, during the summer of 2015 and broadly in parallel with this review. This was in order to ensure that the States' preferred objective of opening the LMDC schools no later than September 2018 could be met if approval to proceed were confirmed.

The primary focus of this further design development of the scheme originally presented in 2014, has been to develop a solution which could positively respond to the as yet unknown outcome of the Strategic Education Review without detriment to the overall target programme.

As well as accommodating the option for different pupil numbers the redesign process (which has continued during this review), has also endeavoured to take account of previous concerns as well as any issues raised during this review.

Having considered the project's background and objectives I believe the redesign now provides a rational solution for either a 600 or 960 pupil HS based on the revised brief. It also addresses a number of issues which gave rise to the original concern and in my opinion represents a considerable improvement on the original proposals.

In considering whether the scheme offers 'Best Value' it's necessary to establish whether the project has met its objectives and whether these objectives are appropriate within the overall project context. Hence the need for the narrative summary to be restated and for this to continue to be refreshed assuming the project continues into construction.

Against the backdrop of the target programme wholesale revisiting of the original brief is not in my opinion realistic if the September 2018 opening is to be achieved and if the significant

investment already made in the project is not to be lost. My remit has therefore, been to interrogate the current proposals, to challenge where necessary and to highlight areas in which value might be improved and lessons learned incorporated; but always within the context of what is realistic within the programme.

Based on my evaluation of the current proposals for a 600/960 high school ie Options B1 and B2 (see figures 1-14) I have summarised my conclusions and recommendations under a series of category headings as follows.

### **18.2 Overall Project Objectives:**

Overall I consider the original and recently adjusted project objectives have been met and that the project as designed, except as noted below, represents a reasonable response to the overall project brief as it has developed.

Whilst not being particularly radical from an educational perspective the objectives for these schools are I believe a reasonable development of the current situation in Guernsey and allow for flexibility in terms of teaching and learning styles suited to the skills, aspirations and educational infrastructure of the island. The proposals for the schools have also been interrogated and validated by both Schools and the Education Department Educational advisers, and this process continues. So in my opinion the designs reasonably meet the educational brief set except as noted below.

An area which I believe may require further consideration is the transition from Primary to Secondary and specifically the nurturing provision for year 7 and 8 students. The opportunities for a 'seamless transition' on this site were specifically highlighted by both Head Teachers and this does not currently appear to be clearly reflected in the latest proposals.

The briefing requirement for a separately run nursery has been met, but for the longer term the connection between Nursery and Reception will not be ideal for a Foundation Years provision if the nursery becomes part of the primary school which appears may arise from the current nursery provision review.

The stated objectives for the CAS Unit (ie a new purpose built specialist facility for both the school and wider island) appear to be met, although this facility has and continues to be subject to a number of siting and building layout changes. So it's important to ensure that the overall objectives for this facility are not lost in the change process.

The stated objectives for community use in terms of both a community base and the wider shared use of facilities are generally met in terms of overall layout; but success will ultimately depend on the detailed zoning of facilities and on how well these are managed.

The objectives for community sports generally appear to be met in terms of blending the schools' provision with that of the wider sporting community, specifically netball, volleyball and basketball. The arrangements for effectively linking the sports centre with the main high school and for effectively handling large numbers of spectators are I believe less convincing, and would benefit from further review and development.

### **18.3 Stakeholder Engagement :**

Regular stakeholder engagement has been undertaken throughout the design process as outlined above. Whilst this has varied in scope and has at times been somewhat hurried (eg the initial engagement with Sports and Leisure and the sports bodies, and with the schools during the period of revised design) the overall provision appears to have met with broad support from the stakeholders and authorities consulted.

There remains however, some uncertainty as to whether the provision of a community base will work within the local context and discussions on this are understood to be ongoing. Also some

stakeholders, such as the parents and pupils of the schools, are yet to be actively engaged. With the design now at RIBA Stage 3+ appropriate parent, pupil and local community engagement would be strongly recommended to assist ownership and valuing of the project once completed.

Continued engagement and involvement of the principal sports bodies/Sports Commissioners is also recommended to ensure that their requirements are met in the detailed design development so as to ensure this facility works effectively and as intended as a shared high quality sports venue.

#### **18.4 Site strategy :**

The overall site strategy is I believe a well-considered and clearly articulated response to the brief and to the site and programme constraints. It makes good use of existing site features and fits well into its setting as reflected in the Environment Department's positive responses to the revised proposals.

#### **18.5 Building design and layout :**

The building design is not unnecessarily complex or flamboyant, but it is well ordered and elegant with design features which I believe will inspire pupils, staff and the wider community. Compared to many mainland BSF and Academy projects it is, as required by the brief, relatively restrained and I believe it strikes a good balance of delight and functionality.

Much of the design language has been derived from the earlier Les Beaucamps HS and LMDC therefore, represents a progressive (Mark2) refinement of this earlier model incorporating a range of positive lessons learned whilst avoiding the negative feedback from this previous project. With the same principal design team as LBHS being involved in this project, viewing the proposals through the lens of the completed and generally successful environment of LBHS would suggest that LMDC should be no less successful and inspiring to users.

#### **18.6 Size :**

This category remains perhaps the most contentious and so I will deal with each principal element of the scheme in turn.

- **High School :**

When compared to the equivalent overall gross internal floor areas for UK State Schools (as defined under BB98), for equivalent forms of entry the proposal for Option B1 for 600 pupils is approximately 19% above the recommendations. For Option B2 for 960 pupils the proposals are approximately 3% under the recommendations.

*NB A notional 16% Guernsey factor was recommended by an Independent Review in 2005 but it is understood this was related to pupil numbers rather than forms of entry.*

Option B1 therefore compares less favourably than B2, and is considerably more generous than would be anticipated for an equivalent State School on the mainland. But compared to equivalent independent schools on both the mainland and on-island with class numbers of 24 or less, and to which the Guernsey model appears more closely aligned, it is in my experience, comparable in terms of area.

With regard to the preferred class-size model of 24 on which the brief was calculated, it is empirically evident from the independent fee paying sector on both the mainland and on-island that class sizes of between 18 and 24 are preferred and work in terms of pupil support and parental expectations. The State Sector in UK simply cannot afford to make this offer no matter how desirable. For good reason therefore, Guernsey has consistently set its sight towards class numbers of 24 maximum and this is foundational to the brief. To change this fundamental requirement at an advanced stage of the project would require a complete rethink and redesign which would not be possible within the preferred



programme. The more recent design revisions used the original accommodation 'building blocks' rather than being based on a complete briefing rethink. Hence the redesign was possible within a relatively short period.

There is also an understandable concern as to whether the new HS school might feel empty and lacking in a sense of energy if occupied below the projected figures. From the most recent pupil projections run for the various strategic scenarios, it would appear that pupil projections for LMDC (assuming +/-zero for baseline sensitivity) would support 24 in each form of entry at least through to 2028. Projections beyond this point are hazy and will in due course need to take account of any positive action aimed at reducing the current and recently reported demographic decline. There is also little doubt that the current decline in numbers at LMDC resulting from the poor facilities should be corrected once the new proposals are completed.

Overall therefore, I consider the provisions for Option B1 for 600 pupils to be generous but not inappropriately large given the context. If required there is no doubt that area reductions could be achieved but not within the current overall programme aimed at delivery of the new school by September 2018. There would need to be a considerable pause to rethink the brief. If undertaken it would also result in additional costs which are likely to erode any potential financial savings as demonstrated in the G&T's illustration on page 1078 of Education Department's letter dated April 2015.

The area for Option B2 for 960 pupils however, is clearly more efficient and more comparable with the recommendations of BB98; but it is also inextricably linked to Option B1. It can be built either as a single phase project or with Option B1 as a first phase anticipating the future expansion and offering flexibility to respond to the outcome of the Strategic Review in March 2016. There is a judgement to be made therefore, as to whether the benefits of Option B2 justify the generosity of Option B1. In the circumstances I believe this approach could be justified.

- **Primary School :**

When compared to BB99 the primary school is approximately 15% above the recommended area which is just less than the notional 16% Guernsey Factor. In terms of area per pupil place at approximately 6.5sqm per pupil it is mid-range compared to other primary schools on-island and is less than comparable mainland independent schools.

Again, having designed numerous primary schools I believe there would be scope for area reductions if required, but again not without prejudice to the current programme for the delivery of this project. This would again require a significant rethink to effectively rebalance the design and would incur redesign and project delay costs as already demonstrated. But there may be a case for reviewing the generic brief for future primary schools which unlike the secondary estate still form part of a future replacement programme.

- **Nursery :**

At 116m<sup>2</sup> the nursery is a modest component of the overall project and is understood to have been based on the requirements of the independent nursery provider (ie Happy Days). The main activity area is approx. 62sqm equates to 3.9sqm per pupil assuming a group size of 16. UK regulations require a minimum of 2.3sqm per child for 3-4year olds. So whilst this provision is more generous than the minimum the modest amount of additional space allows much greater opportunities for effective indoor activities.

- **Sports Centre :**

The proposals include a sports hall which is virtually twice the size of a normal school sports hall - ie 960sqm compared with 594sqm. This is entirely due to the requirements for netball and spectators as defined by the various sports bodies.

The case for not losing this opportunity to effectively 'piggyback' the last replacement secondary school project so as to provide facilities not otherwise affordable appears strategically very strong. But only if the facilities can be effectively managed to function as intended.

Effective sub-division of what will be a very large main sports hall will also be important to ensure maximum flexibility for school use and smaller community groups.

- **CAS Unit :**

This size of this facility is based entirely on empirical evidence of current cramped facilities which it will replace as well as from input from staff who will use it. I therefore, see no reason to question this provision in terms of size.

- **Community Base :**

As for the CAS Unit I see no reason to question this provision in terms of size.

### **18.7 Specification :**

The general level of specification proposed for the external and internal building fabric is in my opinion entirely appropriate to a good quality well-tempered environment. I do not believe that it is excessive for the design objectives and longevity of facility required although there is always scope for critical review and improvement as part of the project's ongoing value management process.

One specific and key aspect of value management relates to the project's sustainability strategy and energy use targets. This is essential to ensure that the longer term costs in-use are minimised and that the development is appropriately sustainable.

### **18.8 Capital and Revenue Costs :**

G&T (project QS) have provided a detailed comparative cost report – See Appendix 4. This shows that capital costs compare favourably with similar projects both on the mainland and on-island. As has been shown on the mainland with for example the UK 'Priority School Building Programme' schools can without doubt be built for significantly lesser cost. But this is based on significant levels of repetition and lesser specification standards than the Guernsey model aspires to. Hence on the evidence I believe the capital costs to be reasonable for the facilities being provided and I believe the project costs have been effectively managed to avoid budget drift.

I would also note that the changes instigated since the previous 600 pupil HS scheme was reviewed in February 2015 have already seen significant improvements and efficiencies including:

- Omission of the ramped bridge access to first floor.
- Omission of the substantial under-croft to the sports hall.
- More efficient double banked classrooms arrangements for the HS.
- Reduction in overall area of the 600 pupil option by approx. 40m<sup>2</sup>.

With regard to Revenue costs, the concerns raised on this by T&R were I believe, adequately dealt with in the Education Department's letter dated April 2015.

### **18.9 Programme :**

On the evidence presented I believe that allowing an adequate contingency to ensure completion and fitting out of the new schools ready for a September 2018 opening, the current programme is just achievable assuming no further pauses so that the works commence as programmed in August 2016.

Whilst I believe some design improvements and refinements are still possible within the programme, further fundamental design review beyond the radical changes now instigated with the B1 and B2 Options would not be.

### **18.10 Procurement Approach :**

The two stage tender process builds on the approach adopted for LBHS but with continued competition through to completion of Stage 2. For the nature and scale of this project I believe this to a wholly appropriate and well tested approach. The continued interest shown by the selected contractors as workshops with them have continued, also suggests that assuming the programme is not further delayed tenders should be competitive.

If well managed this improvement on the LBHS approach should also deliver further value enhancements, particularly if the process allows / requires contractors to contribute to the process of innovation and improvement. Some form of incentive arrangement may also be appropriate to encourage this as has successfully been used for many other major projects.

### **18.11 Lessons learned :**

As designed LMDC is effectively a refinement of LBHS and as such there is an invaluable as-built working example to use for reference. If the lessons learned on both this project and on the earlier St Sampson's HS are implemented this must improve the value for money of the current scheme. But this critical feedback including the results of the LBS Post Occupancy Review has to be systematically taken into account during the continued design development of LMDC.

### **18.12 Areas for further design review :**

On the basis of this review of the proposals (as illustrated in figures 1-14) I would suggest further consideration of the following specific areas:

- The entrance to the main sports centre appears somewhat hidden and the links with the main school via an open bridge seems inappropriate to support the shared and integrated use anticipated. (It is understood that this has been revised to a covered but unheated link in the most recent revision.)
- I also have some concern as to the capacity of the Sports Centre to accommodate the large numbers of spectators understood to be anticipated for major events, with limited foyer space and relatively narrow circulation routes for the numbers anticipated. I would suggest that further review and validation of this be undertaken with the Sports Commissioners and users.
- The provision of facilities for sports science, (particularly for the 960 HS) may benefit from further review both with Leisure Services and the high school.
- The level of storage for the sports hall is less than might have been anticipated for a main hall of this size and is less differentiated than the level of regular shared use would imply.
- The pedestrian approach to the primary school would I believe benefit from a more direct link from the central spine and I understand this is currently being worked on.
- The scope of hygiene provisions for both PS and HS seems light for a comprehensive level of inclusion which might be expected in any new school and to which it is understood this development aspires.
- The absence of an accessible wc at first floor in the sports Centre is not ideal requiring lift access for disabled users to ground floor facilities.
- Similarly the accessible wc arrangement in the CAS unit appears unbalanced with only one accessible wc for primary pupils.

- The dedicated storage provision in both the HS and PS seems more limited than from experience I would have anticipated and may benefit from further review with the users.
- There appears no allowance for a recording studio in the HS music faculty which for a new high school would not be unusual particularly for 960 pupils. Further validation of this would therefore be recommended.

### 18.13 Summary

On the basis of the above and subject to the recommendations made, I consider the current proposals do represent a reasonably well balanced and appropriate solution which can be delivered for September 2018 and which will result in a valuable investment.

In the context of the project programme I consider the current project proposals represent 'Good Value', but that 'Best Value' for this project will only be achieved through continual and appropriate refinement throughout the balance of design and construction stages. Key parties should be effectively engaged and incentivised to continue to explore improvements where realistically possible.

In view of the difficulties which have occurred over the last year this review has endeavoured to facilitate a shared understanding of the project. I would recommend that this narrative clarity needs to continue through to construction and into post implementation. I would also recommend that the structured process of value appraisal managed by Project Managers JLL be reinforced and strengthened as the project progresses. This needs to be as transparent as possible and need to include both T&R and Education with positive communication between key parties at its heart.

Finally there should, I would suggest, be on-going Project Guardianship to ensure the stated brief objectives and design quality are maintained and that the strong brief narrative is not lost during the more detailed stages of design development and construction.

Alan Brown

December 2015