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1.0 Introduction

1.1 This benchmarking report has been jointly prepared by the North Territory Team and hub North Scotland.

1.2 Further to the publication of the Hub North Scotland (hubco) Secondary Schools benchmarking report, we have developed a similar analysis for Primary Schools. This report has been prepared to provide Local Authority shareholders within the North Territory useful information on how we have, as partners, responded to Scottish Governments Building Schools for the Future Primary School funding metrics.

1.3 Education projects form an important part of hubco’s business. There are currently seven primary school projects that are either under development or in construction for four Local Authority shareholders. Three of these projects are combined with secondary schools as part of 3 – 18 campus solutions, one is a refurbishment project and three of these projects are standalone primary schools.

1.4 The primary school programme has been an interesting journey and this report analyses accommodation, cost and programme benchmarking and includes a comparison with the SFT pilot primary school.

1.5 It provides helpful information on the lessons learnt from the programme and the savings that can be delivered by developing a two-storey design.

1.6 From the exercise undertaken we have been able to identify an effective and efficient model.

1.7 To further develop our benchmarking database, and as with the Secondary Schools, we would encourage you as shareholders to share similar data you may have on accommodation, cost and programming in a similar format from other procurement routes so that we can learn from your existing approach to Primary School design and delivery.

1.8 This is our first primary school benchmarking report and the intention is to regularly update this information as more projects come through the pipeline and current projects reach operational status. This will provide accurate cost information and highlights the Value for Money approach at the heart of the hub procurement route.
2.0 Executive Summary

2.1 hubco has been appointed to deliver four standalone primary schools to the value of £42.4m through a combination of direct appointment and the Scottish Schools for the Future (SSF) programme. The direct appointment on schools outwith the SSF programme is a positive indicator in confidence as hubco as a delivery partner.

2.2 hubco is also delivering three 3 – 18 campus projects which include primary and nursery education provision. The total value of these projects is £98.1m.

2.3 The programme takes approximately 2,390 children out of unsuitable accommodation.

2.4 Over 21,743m² of primary school and nursery accommodation is being constructed.

2.5 Working in collaboration, Local Authorities and hubco have worked hard to develop an effective primary school model and have learned lessons from early North projects. We have also learned from the SFT Lairdsland Primary School pilot project and adopted these design principles and developed our own effective and efficient solution. An example of this is Kirn Primary School for Argyll and Bute Council which has achieved the accommodation metric and has minimised land take. Adopting this approach has reduced the following costs in comparison with other comparator projects:

1. Accommodation m²/pupil;

2. Lifecycle Maintenance and Facilities Management costs £/pupil;

3. Overall capital costs and £/pupil; and

4. Reduced external works costs.
2.0 Executive Summary

2.6 Through analysis of the hubco schools data and the SFT pilot project data we have developed refined accommodation and cost metrics for the North Territory as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary School Sub category</th>
<th>North Territory Suggested m² per child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 — 231</td>
<td>8.5 m² +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232 — 462</td>
<td>8.5 m² — 7.5 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280 — 350</td>
<td>7.5 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 — 462</td>
<td>7.5 m² — 9 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463+</td>
<td>9 m² — 7.5 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary School Sub category</th>
<th>North Territory Suggested £/m²</th>
<th>£/child (Q2 2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 — 231</td>
<td>(Q2 2015)</td>
<td>(Q2 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232 — 462</td>
<td>£3,100/m² +</td>
<td>£26,000/pupil+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280 — 350</td>
<td>£3,100/m² — £3,000/m²</td>
<td>£23,000/pupil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 — 462</td>
<td>£3,000/m² — £23,000/pupil</td>
<td>£27,000/pupil-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463+</td>
<td>£3,000/m² -</td>
<td>£27,000/pupil -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 With reference to Section 4 of this report it is apparent that these refined metrics do not align completely with the Scottish Government targets. On the basis of the above hubco is projecting that primary schools up to 350 pupil roll excluding early years and community accommodation can be delivered for under £10,000,000.

2.8 hubco is developing a primary school design manual and standard approach to school design in conjunction with Local Authorities. The best approach to this would be to develop designs from the outset on new projects within the hubco programme and we are working with Authorities to achieve this.

2.9 In developing the budget it is essential for Local Authorities to consider not only the construction cost but all costs associated with the development and a useful checklist is included elsewhere covering costs such as off-site works and internal costs.

2.10 Preconstruction development phase programmes typically last 13 months. Using a traditional OJEU route to procure the works would result in a programme that would be approximately three to six months longer.
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2.11 Construction phase programmes for new build on a clean site typically 60-70 weeks with multi-phased projects with demolition taking between 90-100 weeks.

2.12 Early consultation and challenge of the use of space is essential to achieve the maximum curriculum timetable efficiency. Accommodation that is flexible allows spaces to have multiple uses and this is desirable. This process would typically take around three to six months to develop and report on the findings and should be completed prior to the start of the development phase.

2.13 Identification of site and associated option appraisals is required prior to the start of the development phase. This will allow identification of abnormal costs and risks early in the process. This work should include early site investigation work, flood risk assessment, planning constraints and ground radar survey to understand if there are significant utility diversions. Local Authorities should consider deducting these from the land value if appropriate.
3.1 hubco has been appointed to deliver four standalone primary schools to the value of £42.4m through a combination of direct appointment and the Scottish Schools for the Future (SSF) programme. The direct appointment on schools outwith the SSF is a positive indicator in hubco as a development partner. hubco is also delivering three, 3 – 18 campus projects which include primary and nursery education provision. The total value of these projects is £98.1m. Two projects are revenue financed and five are capitally funded.

3.2 It is not possible to accurately separate the cost of the 3 -18 campus primary schools as they are combined with secondary school and community accommodation on a single site therefore a cost analysis for these elements does not form part of this report. The North standalone primary school projects are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brimmond (New Build)</td>
<td>Aberdeen City Council</td>
<td>£11,689,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wick Noss (New Build)</td>
<td>The Highland Council</td>
<td>£15,397,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirn (New Build)</td>
<td>Argyll &amp; Bute Council</td>
<td>£8,881,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunoon (Refurbishment)</td>
<td>Argyll &amp; Bute Council</td>
<td>£6,448,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£42,415,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 The Wick Noss project was designed to RIBA stage D by The Highland Council prior to being transferred into the North Territory programme. The other projects have been developed by hubco from first principles.

3.4 The programme including the Alford and Wick Campus projects delivers the following scope:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>GIFA m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brimmond</td>
<td>460 pupils</td>
<td>4,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wick Community Campus (3 – 18)</td>
<td>420 pupils</td>
<td>3,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wick Noss</td>
<td>420 pupils</td>
<td>4,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alford Community Campus (3 – 18)</td>
<td>380 pupils</td>
<td>3,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirn</td>
<td>380 pupils</td>
<td>2,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunoon</td>
<td>330 pupils</td>
<td>2,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,390 pupils</td>
<td>21,743m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above hubco is delivering a Complex Needs primary school project for Aberdeen City Council but this is excluded from the figures.
4.0 Scottish Government Targets

4.1 Scottish Government (SG) award funding for primary schools on the basis of the following metrics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Schools</th>
<th>m² per child</th>
<th>£ per m²</th>
<th>£ per m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Q 2012</td>
<td>2nd Q 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 — 231</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232 — 462</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463+</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 The cost and space metric was developed from Scottish Futures Trust database of projects at £2,350/m² which equates to £15,000-£20,000/pupil at 2nd Q 2012 prices, which is £18,000-£23,500/pupil at 2nd Q 2015 prices.

4.3 The metrics do not include provision for early years and nursery and these are subject to care commission standards which calculate space allocation differently to the SFT metric. These calculations can vary significantly depending on the number of children.

4.4 The above targets are very challenging and the North Territory has responded positively to individual m²/pupil and cost £/m² targets, however, when combined they are considered difficult to achieve.

4.5 Considerable work has been completed on challenging the use of space. This has highlighted particular challenges within primary schools at the 0 – 231 and 380+ capacity. Particular challenges include:

1. Two hours minimum of PE per pupil per week. Internal gym spaces need to work hard. Challenge is being made around timetabling external PE areas as well as internal spaces within the curriculum;

2. To maximise space dining needs to work in tandem with the gym and this can potentially save on provision of an additional gym space within 380+ capacity projects;

3. Local Authority catering teams have specific requirements on the scope of kitchen installations and this can be conservative and result in additional accommodation and cost being added to a project;

4. Cloakrooms need to be carefully planned and appropriately sized to ensure they are fit for purpose.
5.0 Primary Schools Accommodation Benchmarking

5.1 The North Territory primary schools programme is delivering the following accommodation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Primary Role</th>
<th>Nursery Roll</th>
<th>Total Roll</th>
<th>GIFA m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brimmond</td>
<td>420 pupils</td>
<td>40 pupils (40/40)</td>
<td>460 pupils</td>
<td>4,744 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wick Community Campus (3 – 18)</td>
<td>360 pupils</td>
<td>60 pupils (60/60)</td>
<td>420 pupils</td>
<td>3,841 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wick Noss</td>
<td>390 pupils</td>
<td>30 pupils (30/30)</td>
<td>420 pupils</td>
<td>4,620 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alford Community Campus (3 – 18)</td>
<td>350 pupils</td>
<td>30 pupils (30/30)</td>
<td>380 pupils</td>
<td>3,064 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirn</td>
<td>350 pupils</td>
<td>30 pupils (30/30)</td>
<td>380 pupils</td>
<td>2,849 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunoon</td>
<td>330 pupils</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>330 pupils</td>
<td>2,625 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,200 pupils</strong></td>
<td><strong>190 pupils</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,390 pupils</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,743m²</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Analysis of the dedicated primary accommodation provision is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Primary Role</th>
<th>GIFA m²</th>
<th>Like for Like Funded Accommodation m²</th>
<th>Dedicated Primary Provision GIFA m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brimmond</td>
<td>420 pupils</td>
<td>4,744 m²</td>
<td>(551)</td>
<td>4,193 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wick Community Campus (3 – 18)</td>
<td>360 pupils</td>
<td>3,841 m²</td>
<td>(562)</td>
<td>3,279 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wick Noss</td>
<td>390 pupils</td>
<td>4,620 m²</td>
<td>(1,022)</td>
<td>3,598 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alford Community Campus (3 – 18)</td>
<td>350 pupils</td>
<td>3,064 m²</td>
<td>(196)</td>
<td>2,868 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirn</td>
<td>350 pupils</td>
<td>2,849 m²</td>
<td>(296)</td>
<td>2,553 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunoon</td>
<td>330 pupils</td>
<td>2,625 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,625 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,200 pupils</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,743m²</strong></td>
<td><strong>(2,627m²)</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,116m²</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Within the like for like Funded Accommodation GIFA stated above the programme has delivered additional accommodation and facilities and this will make a positive impact on local communities. Examples include:

1. Community Learning and Development;
2. Pre-school accommodation;
3. Nursery accommodation;
4. Additional Support Needs;
5. MUGA all weather pitches;

5.4 The accommodation benchmarking analysis includes comparisons to the SFT pilot project Lairdsland Primary School. This is a very useful comparison as Lairdsland has achieved the GIFA m²/pupil metric. It does not compare Dunoon Primary School as this is a refurbishment project. The GIFA m²/pupil excluding like for like Funded Accommodation noted within item 5.2 equates to the following:
5.0 Primary Schools Accommodation Benchmarking

Spider Graph 1

5.5 It is evident from spider graph 1 that the early primary school projects designed directly by participants (Wick Noss and Alford Campus) and designed within the hubco programme (Brimmond) sit outside the SFT metric. These schools have followed a more traditional and conservative approach and this has resulted in an outcome that does not align to the SFT m2/pupil metric. The Kirn Primary school project for Argyll and Bute Council is an excellent example of how hubco and the council have developed a two-storey design that aligns with the accommodation metric and compares favourably with the SFT Lairdsland pilot.

The design approach on the Kirn project has been successful by:

1. Adopting SFT’s pilot design approach;
2. Early consultation and challenging the use of space;
3. Creating accommodation that is flexible;
4. Creating covered external areas that become useable all year round;
5. Focussing on the installation of quality furniture that encourages teachers and children to use spaces; and
6. Maximising the use of natural light and creating a connectivity between the internal and external spaces.
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Comparison of the Kirn Primary School project with the earlier projects such as Brimmond, Wick Noss, Wick Campus and Alford Campus shows that this is an efficient and effective model. This has in turn achieved significant whole life cycle savings as the design model is on metric. In comparison with the accommodation metric the Kirn model has saved 0.21m²/pupil which equates to a total capital cost saving of around £200,000.

hubco would strongly recommend that when Participants are considering a new build primary school that they adopt the principles of the Kirn model. Building upon these design principles would allow the project to be effectively delivered from both a teaching and building efficiency perspective.

5.6 A very important factor to achieve efficiencies on these projects is ensuring that an optimal site area is developed as many projects develop too much land which puts significant pressure on council capital and revenue budgets. The analysis of land take on the primary school projects is as follows:

North Territory - Site m² to GIFA ratio

Spider Graph 2
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5.7 It is really important to select a site that has enough space to develop all the facilities required but is not excessive requiring the need for unnecessary external works/landscaping. Some councils prefer single storey construction from a teaching perspective and it is recommended to visit Lairdsland Primary School to understand how this has been achieved using a different approach to design. The following table indicates the number of storeys for each project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Nr of storeys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brimmond</td>
<td>One and a half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wick Noss</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lairdsland</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirn</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Wick Noss project is further constrained by having to develop the existing site in phases. The Alford site was transferred to the council through a section 75 and the site has a number of significant constraints, the main one being topography.
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Spider Graph 4

5.8 Spider Graph 3 and 4 reinforce the advantages of multi-storey construction. The projects with a greater proportion of accommodation on the upper floors are significantly more efficient than those with a large ground floor footprint as they benefit from efficiencies in the following basic construction elements:

1. Foundations;
2. Ground floor construction;
3. Frame;
4. Façade;
5. Roof;
6. Site Works.

5.9 Using the benchmarking from the North Territory our analysis suggests that Local Authorities should plan on the basis of the following accommodation metrics:
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| Primary School School Capacity | Sub category | North Territory Suggested
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 — 231</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.5m² +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232 — 462</td>
<td>232 — 280</td>
<td>8.5m² - 7.5m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>280 — 350</td>
<td>7.5m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>350 — 462</td>
<td>7.5m² - 9m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463+</td>
<td></td>
<td>9m² - 7.5m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.10 These metrics are challenging, but deliverable, and rely on:

1. Adopting SFTs pilot design approach;
2. Early consultation and challenging the use of space;
3. Creating accommodation that is flexible;
4. Creating covered external areas that become useable all year round;
5. Challenging the timetabling of internal and external PE areas;
6. Maximising dining space working it in tandem with the gym;
7. Challenging the efficiency of kitchen space.
6.0 Primary Schools Cost Benchmarking

6.1 The total territory programme value excluding primary accommodation within the 3 – 18 campus projects is £41,890,000. Deflated to 2nd Q2 2012 prices (SFT funding base date) and excluding Dunoon Primary School refurbishment project, this equates to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>GIFA m²</th>
<th>Total 2nd Q 2012</th>
<th>£/pupil</th>
<th>£/m² 2nd Q 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brimmond</td>
<td>460 pupils</td>
<td>4,744</td>
<td>£10,878,000</td>
<td>£23,648</td>
<td>£2,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wick Noss</td>
<td>420 pupils</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>£12,970,000</td>
<td>£30,881</td>
<td>£2,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirn</td>
<td>380 pupils</td>
<td>2,849</td>
<td>£7,366,000</td>
<td>£19,384</td>
<td>£2,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFT Pilot Lairdsland</td>
<td>280 pupils</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>£5,620,000</td>
<td>£20,071</td>
<td>£2,669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 The project costs excluding Nursery provision, Community Learning and Development and other like for like Funded Accommodation are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Primary Role</th>
<th>Primary GIFA m²</th>
<th>Total 2nd Q 2012</th>
<th>£/pupil</th>
<th>£/m² 2nd Q 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brimmond</td>
<td>420 pupils</td>
<td>4,193</td>
<td>£9,606,000</td>
<td>£22,872</td>
<td>£2,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wick Noss</td>
<td>390 pupils</td>
<td>3,598</td>
<td>£10,095,000</td>
<td>£25,885</td>
<td>£2,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirn</td>
<td>350 pupils</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>£6,601,000</td>
<td>£18,859</td>
<td>£2,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFT Pilot Lairdsland</td>
<td>280 pupils</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>£5,620,000</td>
<td>£20,071</td>
<td>£2,669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 The data noted within item 6.2 equates to the following:

**North Territory - £/pupil inc Abnormals, exc Location 2nd Q 2012**

- **Wick Noss (390 pupils)**: £25,000
- **Kirn (350 pupils)**: £20,000
- **Lairdsland (280 pupils)**: £15,000
- **Brimmond (420 pupils)**: £10,000

Spider Graph 5
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6.4 It is clear from spider graph 5 and 6 that achieving the funding metric is challenging.

6.5 The hub North schools including abnormal costs are not achieving the £/pupil and £/m² metric. However, when like for like funded accommodation and abnormal costs are omitted we are close to achieving the cost metrics and this is a positive outcome. A worked example of this is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kirn Primary School</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£/m²</th>
<th>£/pupil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of Project 2nd Q 2015 (2,849m² &amp; 350 primary pupils + 30 nursery)</td>
<td>£8,615,000</td>
<td>£3,024</td>
<td>£22,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deduct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nursery and Early Years Provision (296m²)</td>
<td>(£900,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enhanced Specification</td>
<td>(£235,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Abnormals – asbestos/site levels</td>
<td>(£235,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total excl abnormalities and like for like accommodation outwith metric (2,553m² &amp; 350 primary pupils only)</td>
<td>£7,245,000</td>
<td>£2,834</td>
<td>£20,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>£2,748</td>
<td></td>
<td>£20,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>+£86</td>
<td></td>
<td>+£90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6 On the basis of the benchmarking from the North Territory our analysis suggests that Local Authorities should plan on the basis of the following construction cost metrics including abnormal costs at 2nd Q 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary School</th>
<th>North Territory Suggested £/m² (Q2 2015)</th>
<th>North Territory Suggested £/child (Q2 2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 — 231</td>
<td>£3,100/m²+</td>
<td>£26,000/pupil+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232 — 462</td>
<td>£3,100/m²+ - £3,000/m² - £27,000/pupil -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463+</td>
<td>£3,000/m²-</td>
<td>£27,000/pupil -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above figures exclude like for like funded accommodation and this should be added on the basis of the proposed m² to be built x £/m² noted above.
7.0 Exclusions to Primary Schools Cost Benchmarking

7.1 The above figures do not include Local Authority direct costs as follows:

1. Information Technology;
2. Smart Boards;
3. Internal fees;
4. Revenue Finance professional services.

7.2 The figures do not include for the following:

1. Off-site utility infrastructure upgrades;
2. Off-site roadworks;
3. Off-site core path re-routing;
4. Location Factor.
8.0 BCIS TPI Forecast

8.1 The current Building Cost Information Service Tender Price Index forecast is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>5.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>5.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These percentages are constantly under review and changing on a month-to-month basis. Local Authorities are recommended to track these monthly and reflect any changes within the capital plan.
9.0 Primary Schools Programme Benchmarking

9.1 Programme benchmarking from the North Territory projects is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Development Stage inc Approvals (RIBA A – F) (NPR Acceptance to FC/CC)</th>
<th>Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brimmond</td>
<td>47 weeks</td>
<td>65 weeks*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wick Noss</td>
<td>63 weeks</td>
<td>97 weeks*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirn</td>
<td>60 weeks</td>
<td>51 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 56 weeks 71 weeks

*The construction programmes for these projects have encountered some significant challenges as follows:

Wick Noss, 1. Severe weather conditions and high winds damaging the building; and 2. Timber kit contractor withdrawing from the project after commercial close and contract execution and prior to the sub-contract being executed.

Brimmond, Performance of a supply chain partner who had to be replaced midway through the construction phase.

These challenges have adversely impacted upon both construction programmes and if these issues had not been encountered it is thought that the original contract durations were robust.

9.2 Typically the development phase is taking around 13 months and this is a fast turnaround for schools projects. To date the pre-NPR and NPR stages have been protracted and this report seeks to improve this stage by providing Local Authorities with useful information to set projects up to be procured more efficiently and effectively with programme and cost set at a realistic and deliverable level.

9.3 All of the projects noted above are being developed on existing operational school sites and this has resulted in abnormally long construction programme durations. Typically a new build on a clean site would take 60 weeks and a multi-phased project with demolition would take between 90 - 100 weeks.

9.4 The above timescales exclude the time required prior to NPR to consult and define the needs of the end users. Good examples of this include partnership working on the Argyll and Bute Kirn Primary School project where the authority supported by hub North has a very efficient design. If this work is not completed early in a project’s development journey then it can lead to programme delays and may result in the most efficient solution not being realised.

During this period it is also highly recommended to invest a modest amount of capital to fully understand on-site and off-site constraints and this allows abnormal costs to be identified early.

These early activities are essential to set a school project up for success.
10.0 FM/LCM Benchmarking

10.1 The development journey we have been on has created a primary school design that is very efficient and effective and is below the SFT accommodation metric. This in turn has created improvements in Whole Life Costs as space is working harder on a cost £/pupil basis. Examples of this are:

1. Facilities Management encompassing Protective and Planned Maintenance;
2. Heating, lighting and power costs;
3. Life cycle costs such as replacement and maintenance of building components.
11.0 Scottish Schools for the Future Programme Value for Money within the North Territory

11.1 The North Territory Primary Schools programme has realised the following savings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Heading</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Accommodation Savings on SFT metric</td>
<td>£198,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hard FM/LCM savings over 25 years</td>
<td>£72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Soft FM savings over 25 years</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professional fees in comparison with TPA</td>
<td>£520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Building contractors margin in comparison with TPA</td>
<td>£646,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Primary Schools Programme Savings</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,436,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.2 The above savings have been largely achieved through market testing professional fees and building contractors margin only. Now that we have developed an efficient and effective design solution for the Kirn Primary project below the accommodation metric we expect further savings within future projects in comparison with the early schemes developed.

11.3 If Local Authorities wanted to support a programme of primary school projects there would be further opportunity for savings within the commercial rates included within the Territory Partnering Agreement.
12.0 Lessons Learnt

12.1 During the development of these projects significant lessons have been learnt and these are;

1. Identify abnormal costs and risks early in the process. This work should be considered at the point of site selection and should include early site investigation work, flood risk assessment, planning constraints and ground radar survey to understand if there are significant diversions. Local Authorities should consider deducting these from the land value if appropriate.

2. Adopt an economic and effective design solution. A multi-storey design has proven to be an economic option for primary school buildings.

3. Identify off-site infrastructure requirements early in the process. This work should be considered at the point of site selection and should include potential access constraints and utility infrastructure upgrades. Authorities should consider deducting these from the land value if appropriate.

4. Model both £/pupil and £/m$^2$ to ensure that there is appropriate financial provision within the budget from the start. Useful North Territory metrics are included within section 6.0.

5. Early consultation and challenge of the use of space essential to achieve curriculum timetable efficiency. Accommodation that is flexible and allows spaces to have multiple uses is desirable. This process would typically take around 3 to 6 months to develop and report on the findings. If this work is not completed early in a projects development journey then it can lead to programme delays and may result in the most efficient solution not being realised. This work can also reduce LCM and FM costs.

6. Adopting North Territory accommodation benchmarks as outlined within section 5.0 will provide Local Authorities with a better understanding of the sensitivities of the school role bandings.

7. Accept that sub-optimal sites may be the preferred option, however, implement as early as possible a mitigation strategy that reduces the impact of abnormal costs.

8. Prepare development budgets inclusive of all Local Authority direct costs at budget setting stage. Budgets need to include not only the construction costs but the off-site infrastructure costs, the client direct costs and location factors appropriate to the project. These cost headings are outlined within section 7.0.

9. Monitor the BCIS cost index to ensure that the capital plan has an appropriate Tender Price Index allowance. The current forecasts are identified in section 8.0.
12.0 Lessons Learnt

10. Develop a realistic high level programme. A typical development programme period is 13 months and this does not include the 3 to 6 months pre-NPR work as identified in point five above. Construction periods vary from 60 weeks to 100 weeks depending on phasing and useful information is included within section 9.0.

11. A programme approach has proven to deliver savings within the secondary school programme and if this was adopted within primary schools significant savings can be realised.

12. Focus on performance standards and simplify needs and this will allow the market to respond with the most cost effective solution at that time.

13. Have awareness of the market and products that used to be cost effective but are no longer delivering value for money e.g. masonry.

14. Understand emerging legislation changes that may impact upon the facility.

15. Adopt BREEAM principles but focus on EPC rating.
Benchmarking Dashboard - December 2015

£42m New Primary Schools

Hub North Delivering -
2nr Campus (3-18) including Primary Schools
1nr Severe and Complex Needs school
4nr Stand Alone Primary schools

Approx 2,400 Pupil Places

Lessons Learnt (top five) -
1. Site selection and associated option appraisal
2. Site abnormals
3. Challenge use of space
4. Economic and effective design solution
5. Early preparation of Development Budget (including all Local Authority direct costs)

Programme | Development Stage (NPR Acceptance to FC/CC) | Construction
--- | --- | ---
Average | 56 weeks | 71 weeks

Primary Schools Benchmarking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Capacity</th>
<th>SG Metric</th>
<th>North Territory + Lairdsland</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2Q 2012</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>£2,587</td>
<td>+£217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Q 2015</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>£2,945</td>
<td>+£197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested Budget - £3,000/m²
(2Q 2015 inc. abnormals exc location)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost/pupil (avg)</th>
<th>SG Metric</th>
<th>North Territory + Lairdsland</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£/pupil at 2Q 2012</td>
<td>£17,500</td>
<td>£23,500</td>
<td>+£6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£/pupil at 2Q 2015</td>
<td>£20,500</td>
<td>£26,750</td>
<td>+£6,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 19,000m² of New Primary School Accommodation

Like for Like Funded Accommodation 16,000m²
Hub North Scotland is currently working with four Local Authority Shareholders to develop and deliver the seven primary school projects listed below as part of the Scottish Schools for the Future Programme.

The four standalone projects represent an investment of £42.4m in Primary Schools which will take more than 2,390 children out of Condition B and Suitability B standard schools. The new schools including those within the campus projects at Alford and Wick will provide 21,700 sq m of school accommodation and Community, Assisted Support Needs and Vocational accommodation.

These projects have enabled a database of benchmark information which represents the costs of delivering projects in the hub North territory. It provides the basis for demonstrating value for money and can be used to inform clients and their future investment plans to reflect the real costs of projects in a diverse territory which includes, urban, rural and island locations.

Case study information for Alford Community Campus, Wick Community Campus, Wick (Noss) Primary, Brimmond Primary, Kirn Primary and Complex Needs School Aberdeen are included in this section for information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Local Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brimmond School</td>
<td>Aberdeen City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Complex Needs School Aberdeen</td>
<td>Aberdeen City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Wick Campus (3-18 Primary and Secondary)</td>
<td>The Highland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wick Noss</td>
<td>The Highland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Alford Campus (3-18 Primary and Secondary)</td>
<td>Aberdeenshire Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kirn Primary School</td>
<td>Argyll and Bute Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dunoon Primary School* (Pre- New Project Request)</td>
<td>Argyll and Bute Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Dunoon Primary School is in the pre-New Project Request Stage and is being collaboratively developed with Argyll and Bute Council as a pilot refurbishment project supported by Scottish Futures Trust and Architecture and Design Scotland.
Case Study

Kirn Primary School

“The new school will be a real benefit to many people in and around Kirn for years to come. The focus of the council’s planning service is on making things happen, supporting sustainable economic growth and regeneration. In trying to attract people and investment to the area quality facilities for educating our young people are a must.”

Councillor David Kinniburgh Argyll and Bute Council’s policy lead for planning.

Participant: Argyll & Bute Council
Project Type: New-build primary school facility
Contract Type: Design & Build
Project Value: £8.8 million (Stage 1)
Expected Handover: May 2017
Key partners: Architect: Ryder
Structural Engineer: Fairhurst
M&E Engineer: TUD SUV Wallace Whittle
Project Manager: Sweett Group
Tier 1 Contractor: Morrison Construction, part of the Galliford Try group of companies

The facility: The brief is to design and build a primary school that can cater for 300 pupils on behalf of Argyll & Bute Council. The building will support an accessible range of services and opportunities which will enrich the community it serves and the lives of learners and families. It will have a sustainable design at its heart which will, through its design, promote energy efficiency. The facility will signal the high value placed on learning. A confident, modern building, it will sit well in its context and which will meet and cater for future occupant demands and changes in technology and learning.
Case Study

Complex Needs School, Aberdeen

“This is a special day for the staff, children and parents of Woodlands School and Hazelwood School communities. It is yet another example of this Council’s determination to build the finest school accommodation to allow all of our young people reach their potential.

“It also sees our continuing desire to work in partnership with other agencies such as NHS Grampian to deliver a holistic service which fully meets the needs of children with complex additional support needs.

“We will continue to work with the young people, their parents and staff in the coming months to ensure a smooth transition to the new school.”

Angela Taylor Aberdeen City Council’s Convener of Education and Children’s Committee.

Participant: Aberdeen City Council
Project Type: New-build primary school facility
Contract Type: Design and Build
Project Value: £17.2 million
Expected Handover: April 2017
Key partners: Architect: JM
Structural Engineer: Fairhurst
M&E Engineer: DSSR
Project Manager: Faithful & Gould
Tier 1 Contractor: Ogilvie Construction Ltd

The facility: The brief is to design and build a new school campus for up to 120 full time children and young people with severe and complex educational and medical needs aged from 3 – 18 years. The new school campus will also provide accommodation for family support services including crèche, parents room and support service accommodation and serve as a base for training in moving and handling - MOVE (Mobility Opportunities Via Education). The facility will also incorporate respite facilities.

Complex Needs School, Aberdeen targets so far

>80% of project value tendered to SMEs
3 graduates
3 apprenticeships
Case Study

Noss Primary School

“The new school is going to be very much the heart of the local community so I am delighted that as well as an excellent environment for the young people to learn in, the school will have community facilities for everyone to use and enjoy.”

Wick Councillor Gail Ross Vice Chair of the Council’s Education, Children and Adult Services Committee

Participant: The Highland Council
Project Type: New-build primary school facility
Contract Type: Revenue
Project Value: £15.4 million
Expected Handover: March 2016
Key partners: Architect: GMA Ryder
Structural Engineer: BuroHappold Engineering
M&E Engineer: BuroHappold Engineering

Project Manager: Sweett Group

Tier 1 Contractor: Morrison Construction, part of the Galliford Try group of companies

The facility: Replacing the existing North and Hillhead Primary Schools in Wick, Noss Primary School will cater for nearly 400 pupils and will span 4,620 sq m. It will comprise of 14 classrooms, a library, two nursery rooms, two learning support rooms, a games hall, dining area, a medical room, multi-use games area and a grass pitch.

The project, which is part of the third phase of Scotland’s School for the Future Programme, is co-funded by the Scottish Government and The Highland Council.

North Scotland
Participant: The Highland Council
Project Type: New-build primary school facility
Contract Type: Revenue
Project Value: £15.4 million
Expected Handover: March 2016
Key partners: Architect: GMA Ryder
Structural Engineer: BuroHappold Engineering
M&E Engineer: BuroHappold Engineering

Project Manager: Sweett Group

Tier 1 Contractor: Morrison Construction, part of the Galliford Try group of companies

The facility: Replacing the existing North and Hillhead Primary Schools in Wick, Noss Primary School will cater for nearly 400 pupils and will span 4,620 sq m. It will comprise of 14 classrooms, a library, two nursery rooms, two learning support rooms, a games hall, dining area, a medical room, multi-use games area and a grass pitch.

The project, which is part of the third phase of Scotland’s School for the Future Programme, is co-funded by the Scottish Government and The Highland Council.

Noss Primary School in numbers so far

90% 
The total value of the work awarded to SMEs

5 job created

2 graduates

4 apprenticeships
Case Study

Brimmond School

“This new school will be first and foremost a true community school, in every sense of the word. We have worked very closely with the local communities to make sure the new school meets the needs of the area and provides first-class education for the children at both nursery and primary school age.

“This has been an all-round community effort and I want to pay tribute to the way in which so many people from Bucksburn and Newhills – parents, pupils, teachers, and other school staff – have thrown themselves whole-heartedly into the complicated process which creating a new school always involves.”

Jenny Laing, leader of Aberdeen City Council

Participant: Aberdeen City Council
Project Type: New-build primary school, additional support needs and visual support services
Contract Type: Capital
Project Value: £11.7 million
Handover: October 2015
Key partners: Architect: JM
Structural Engineer: BuroHappold
M&E Engineer: DSSR
Project Manager: Faithful & Gauld
Tier 1 Contractor: Ogilvie Construction

The facility: Built on the site of the former Newhills School in Bucksburn, Aberdeen, Brimmond School has been designed to accommodate the growing school-age population within the area. The new school caters for 420 primary pupils and will provide 80 nursery places, as well as accommodation for visual support services.

In addition to classroom and administration space, the innovative facility features a range of outdoor provision including a cycle track to enable road safety lessons to take place within the school complex, courts for basketball and netball in addition to an all-weather sports pitch, an adventure playground, a sensory garden and a woodland wildlife area.

Covering 4,501 sq m, work on the site officially began in April 2014 under the watchful eye of the pupils who will benefit from the new facility. The bespoke design compliments the modern needs of a primary school facility, providing a first-class education environment for both nursery and primary school age children.

Brimmond School in numbers so far

93%
The total value of the work awarded to SMEs
4
Jobs created
9
Graduates
1
Apprenticeship
Case Study

Wick Community Campus

“Finally we are at the stage when work can begin on the new campus. This is a very exciting day for Wick and is the start of the much anticipated work that will provide Wick with an education service to be rightly proud of.”

“The collaboration between The Highland Council, hub North Scotland Ltd and the Scottish Futures Trust has proved to be a success and we are very proud of everyone that has worked so hard to bring this to fruition.”

Councillor Gail Ross  Caithness civic leader and vice chair of the Highland Council’s education, children and adult services committee

Participant: The Highland Council
Project Type: New-build primary school, secondary school and community facilities
Contract Type: Revenue
Project Value: £48.5 million
Expected Handover: September 2016
Key partners:
Architect: GMA Ryder
Structural Engineer: BuroHappold
M&E Engineer: BuroHappold
Project Manager: Sweett Group
Tier 1 Contractor: Morrison Construction, part of the Galliford Try group of companies
FM Provider: GT FM

The facility: The new Wick Community Campus is set to replace the existing Wick High School, South Primary and Pultneytown Academy Primary School and is being delivered by hub North Scotland after it was appointed as a development partner by the Highland Council.

The innovative campus will consist of two senior school teaching wings as well as a separate primary school with its own access. A special needs wing, sports block, library, swimming pool and fitness suite alongside three sports pitches will complete its offering.

Preparation work for the campus began in 2014, with First Minister Nicola Sturgeon, along with pupils from the three participating schools, leading the official turf cutting which officially marked the commencement of the project’s construction. The main contractor for the build is Morrison Construction, part of the Galliford Try group of companies.

Wick Community Campus in numbers so far

- 73% of the work awarded to SMEs
- 13 apprenticeships
- 9 graduates
- 2 jobs created
Case Study

Alford Community Campus

“Alford Primary School and Alford Academy already have a very close working relationship, and the new campus will develop that bond even further.

“But more than that, the campus will also provide modern, high quality facilities for the wider community, making it a real focal point for day to day activity in Alford. Today marks an important step in developing this excellent resource.”

Provost of Aberdeenshire Jill Webster

Alford Community Campus in numbers so far

|
| 80% | 4 |
| The total value of the work awarded to SMEs | jobs created |
| 5 graduates | 4 apprenticeships |

The project was awarded part-funding through the Scottish Government’s Scotland’s Schools for the Future Programme.

A number of site visits from the campus’ feeder schools were facilitated by hub North Scotland, giving future pupils a first glimpse into the progress being made on site.

Participant: Aberdeenshire Council

Project Type: New-build primary school, secondary school and community facilities

Contract Type: Revenue

Project Value: £32.4 million

Handover: October 2015

Key partners: Architect: Halliday Fraser Munro

Structural Engineer: Fairhurst

M&E Engineer: FES

Project Manager: Sweett Group

Tier 1 Contractor: Morrison Construction, part of the Galliford Try group of companies

FM provider: GT FM

The facility: Work on the new Alford Community Campus officially got underway in June 2014 and followed advance works in October 2013 that saw an access road created for construction traffic and initial ground works.

The facility on the village’s Greystone Road caters for all pupils in early years, primary and secondary education and includes a theatre, sports hall and dance studio, with all-weather and grass playing fields located outside.

Supporting the wider community is a swimming pool, community library and accommodation for Aberdeenshire Council’s community learning and development team.
Details of participants

The hub North Territory brings together all of the public sector bodies in the North of Scotland to deliver a wide range of joint services to achieve better value for money and continuous improvement. These public sector bodies include:

- Aberdeen City Council
- Aberdeenshire Council
- Argyll and Bute Council
- Comhairle nan Eilean Siar
- The Highland Council
- NHS Eileanan Siar Western Isles
- NHS Grampian
- NHS Highland
- NHS Orkney
- NHS Shetland
- Orkney Islands Council
- Police Scotland
- Scottish Fire and Rescue Service