

Report No.  
DCYP12037

## London Borough of Bromley

### PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:** Children and Young People Portfolio Holder

**Date:** For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by the Children and Young People PDS Committee on 20 March 2012

**Decision Type:** Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

**Title:** **ASSET MANAGEMENT PLANNING – POST COMPLETION REVIEW REPORTS**

**Contact Officer:** Robert Bollen, CYP Strategic Property Manager  
Tel: 020 8313 4697 E-mail: robert.bollen@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Gillian Pearson, Director, Children and Young People Services

**Ward:** All

---

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 As part of the Capital Programme Procedures it is a requirement that schemes should be formally reviewed within one year of completion and the outcome of this review be brought to the Portfolio Holder for endorsement.
- 

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 **That the Portfolio Holder endorses the findings of the Post Completion Reviews that have been carried out in respect of the:**
- refurbishment works carried out to create Riverside Beckenham Autistic Centre;
  - modular building works carried out to improve the quality of facilities at the Kingswood Pupil Referral Unit;
  - capital works carried out at to support the creation of Biggin Hill Primary School following the amalgamation of Biggin Hill Infant School and Biggin Hill Junior School.

### Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
  2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People
- 

### Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable:
  2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
  3. Budget head/performance centre:
  4. Total current budget for this head: £
  5. Source of funding:
- 

### Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional):
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
- 

### Legal

1. Legal Requirement: None:
  2. Call-in: Applicable
- 

### Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): 600
- 

### Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

### 3. COMMENTARY

3.1 The Capital Programme Procedures require that a post completion review be carried out within 12 months of the completion of schemes that are included within the programme. This process is designed to determine the Authority's performance in the following key area:

- Were the original scheme objectives achieved?
- Were the scheme costs contained within the original budget?
- Did the scheme complete on time?
- What was the level of customer satisfaction from the end user with the overall process?

3.2 The information set out in the appendix shows the above information for Riverside Beckenham Autistic Centre, Kingswood Pupil Referral Unit and Biggin Hill Primary School.

3.3 The scheme completed with some unavoidable increases over the original budget and extension in the contract programme was met. A full analysis of each project is contained within Appendix 1, 2 and 3 below.

### 4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 One of the main aims of the Council's Asset Management Plan is to ensure that all the partners in the asset management planning processes are fully consulted on the process and its outcomes. Progression of the schemes at Riverside Beckenham, Kingswood Pupil Referral Unit and Biggin Hill Primary School will assist in meeting one of the key outcomes of "Building a Better Bromley" and contributes to the strategy to achieve the status of an Excellent Council. This policy also contributes to key targets within the Children and Young People Services Plan, particularly the outcome that "Children and young people are enabled and encouraged to attend and enjoy school".

### 5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 This report provides information on a Post Completion Review that has been carried out in respect of Riverside Beckenham Autistic Centre, Pupil Referral Unit Kingswood and Biggin Hill Amalgamation. There are no financial implications arising from the matters addressed in this report.

<b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>	Legal and Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	

## RIVERSIDE BECKENHAM AUTISTIC CENTRE – REFURBISHMENT WORKS TO PROVIDE NEW SPECIALIST SCHOOL FACILITY

### Scheme Details

1. The scheme consisted of reconfiguration and refurbishment works affecting the whole of the former Woodbrook school site to provide a specialist primary age school for children with Autistic Spectrum Disorders (ASD).

### Scheme History

2. On 17 March 2009 the Children and Young People Portfolio Holder approved the creation of an autistic specific centre attached to Riverside School, based at the premises of the former Woodbrook Special School in Hayne Road, Beckenham. A fully costed appraisal and Gateway Review report setting out the procurement strategy were approved by the Children and Young People Portfolio Holder on 1 June 2009
3. In consultation with the Head Teacher and Governing Body of Riverside School the Council's appointed consultant for architectural services drew up a scheme to make the Woodbrook building 'fit for purpose' in respect of its intended use.
4. The Woodbrook building had not been in use as a school since September 2008. The scheme was drawn up to enable the school to open to pupils in January 2010 and included adaptations required to make the building 'fit for purpose' for its new use as a teaching and learning environment for pupils with ASD as well as works required to make good the premises maintenance backlog.
5. Due to the requirements of the service the building works had to be completed by December 2009 to enable occupation in January 2010.
6. The pre tender estimate for this project was £990,000. This cost rose to £1,061,104 at tender stage and it was agreed to award the tender to keep the project on programme and seek to value engineer the project with the selected contractor. Following a tender exercise in compliance with corporate procurement procedures, Members approved the award of contract on 13 July 2009. Works subsequently began on 29 July 2009.
7. Once on site savings were sought, but it became clear that the only way to sufficiently reduce the project cost to meet the original budget allocation would be to omit complete sections of work. Savings on the specification were made achieved such as a £3,000 saving on the front entrance canopy specification and £10,000 saved through repairing as opposed to replacing the soft play surfacing. However, after review it was found that further changes would have compromised the school's ability to operate in line with its requirement. Furthermore, any whole scale omissions work areas would have lead to:
  - higher costs if omitted works were completed at a later stage, having lost the economies of scale with a contractor already on site
  - exposed the Council to the risk of additional costs associated with ongoing deterioration if areas of works were left for a further period without refurbishment.
  - if some classrooms were omitted from refurbishment this could affect the ability of the school to take pupils through into Key Stage 2

8. In addition, during the course of the works, there were some unforeseen problems that needed to be addressed, largely as a consequence of the lack of maintenance of the building over a period of years. This exhausted the allowed contingency. In addition to this, there were some further large unexpected costs that arose during the works, these were:
- requirement to renew the roof covering due to poor condition (£50,000);
  - installation of a water booster as water pressure was found to be insufficient to manage the new services effectively (£15,000);
  - additional fencing was required to ensure pupil safety (£6,000);
  - additional tarmacing works were required to the external play area to make safe following the exposure of a concrete slab which left the surface unlevel (£10,000);
  - electrical works to the kitchen to make safe for operation (£5,000).
9. There were related increases to the fees and some additional survey requirements established once on site, largely due to the short period of project development. There was also an unforeseen increase in the furniture and IT and telephony requirements to meet the needs of the school, for example the fibre connection to the site needed to be renewed and connections made between this site and the main Riverside site in Orpington, which increased costs.
10. The scheme was completed on 19 December 2009 in line with the required service deadline and the school opened to pupils in January 2010.
11. The cost variations, as explained above, can be seen in the table below.

	<b>Original Estimate</b>	<b>Tender Estimate</b>	<b>Actual Expenditure</b>	<b>Variance (tender – actual)</b>
<b>Riverside Beckenham Autistic Centre – Refurbishment works to provide new specialist school facility</b>	<b>£990,000</b>	<b>£1,061,104</b>	<b>£1,196,282</b>	<b>£135,178</b>

12. The Riverside ASD scheme was overspent by £22k as at 31st March 2011 and it was agreed by the Executive on 20 July 2011 that this be funded by way of a virement from the carry-forward of £243k on the planned maintenance/modernisation budget.

#### Running Costs

13. Running costs for the building are met through the school's devolved budget.

#### Scheme Objectives

14. The objectives of the scheme were to reduce the costs incurred by the Council in out of borough placements for children with autistic spectrum disorder. Specialist provision tailored to the specific needs of children with ASD that would allow children to remain in the same setting throughout their primary school years and encourage parents to accept in Borough placements for their children by being able to access such specialist provision.

### Assessment of Scheme Success

16. The scheme objectives have been met and the school has been in operation since January 2009 and provided additional capacity for ASD specific provision at primary age.

### Assessment of Contract Efficiency

17. Contract period: 21 weeks  
Start Date: 27 July 2009  
Practical Completion: 9 December 2009  
Over-run: 0 weeks

The project completed on time, despite a significantly challenging programme and a range of unforeseen additional works, as outlined above and the school opened to pupils as anticipated in January 2010. The Authority had no concerns regarding the contractor's performance, and the contractor went out of their way to make the project a success. This is further evidenced by the very small number of defects that had to be addressed at the end of the defects liability period.

### Outstanding Issues and Their Proposed Resolution

18. There are no outstanding issues.

**PUPIL REFERRAL UNIT –  
PROVISION OF NEW MODULAR TEACHING AND ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES**

Scheme Details

1. The scheme consisted of the replacement of outdated and dilapidated temporary hatted accommodation at the Kingswood site on Hayes Lane with refurbished modular units previously used at Bishop Justus School.

Scheme History

2. The accommodation at the Kingswood Pupil Referral Unit was in a serious state of disrepair and the objective was to enhance the teaching environment and increase attainment.
3. A decision was taken to refurbish the modular accommodation previously used by Bishop Justus School prior to the completion of its new school build project for use at the Hayes Lane site. Existing pupils were to be decanted during the build.
4. Significant planning difficulties were experienced with the Greater London Authority and Government Office for London and a mitigation strategy was put in place that led to the accommodation being split to circumnavigate these issues.
5. The delivery of the programme was impacted upon by the discovery of a major water main running across the site. This led to both the reconfiguration of the planned accommodation and resulting delays to the main contract and subsequent works by Thames Water to divert the water main in Summer 2007.
6. The main contract works began on 10 June 2006 and were due for completion on 29 November 2006. However, due to the issue outlined above, a practical completion certificate was not issued for the main works until 20 April 2007.
7. The external works, including demolition, asbestos removal and landscaping, started on 25 June 2007 and were largely completed by September 2007. Works on CCTV, kitchen and waste removal continue until summer 2008 when scheme was completed.
8. A claim was made against Pellings, then the Council's consultants, as a result of the delays that affected the project and in July 2008 a settlement was reached by which Pellings reimbursed the Authority £150,000 with regard to the water main diversion.
9. The cost of the project was slightly above the original estimate as a result of the issues outlined above and can be seen in the table below.

	<b>Original Estimate</b>	<b>Tender Estimate</b>	<b>Actual Expenditure</b>	<b>Variance (tender – actual)</b>
<b>Pupil Referral Unit – Provision of new modular teaching and administration facilities</b>	<b>£2,311,000</b>	<b>£1,579,144</b>	<b>£2,352,000</b>	<b>£41,000</b>

It was agreed in the report to Executive on 20 July 2011 that the overspend on the project would be met by the 2011/12 Schools Capital Maintenance Budget.

#### Running Costs

13. Running costs for the building are met through the school's devolved budget.

#### Scheme Objectives

15. The objectives of the scheme were to improve the learning environment at the Pupil Referral Unit and increase educational attainment.

#### Assessment of Scheme Success

16. The scheme objective of improving the learning environment at the Pupil Referral Unit was met. Furthermore the improvement in educational attainment achieved as a result has surpassed expectations with the Kingswood PRU exceeding the performance of the majority of similar establishments based on comparative benchmarking data.

#### Assessment of Contract Efficiency

17. Contract period: 21 weeks  
Start Date: 10 June 2006  
Practical Completion: 29 November 2006  
Over-run: 21.5 weeks

The project encountered major difficulties as a result of the discovery of a Thames Water water main during the works that led to the need for the planned accommodation to be reconfigured.

#### Outstanding Issues and Their Proposed Resolution

18. There are no outstanding issues.



## **BIGGIN HILL AMALGAMATION – PROVISION OF NEW MODULAR TEACHING AND ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES**

### Scheme Details

1. The scheme consisted works to enable amalgamation of Biggin Hill Infant and Junior Schools with effect from January 2008.

### Scheme History

2. Following a review of surplus places at primary age in Strategic Planning Area 9, discussions were held with Biggin Hill Infant School and Biggin Hill Junior School on a possible amalgamation including lowering the published admission numbers of both schools from 90 to 60. Authorisation to consult on the proposals was provided at the Children and Young People Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee on 17 January 2007.
3. Agreement to progress with the amalgamation project was provided following reports to the Children and Young People Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee on 20 March 2007 and Executive on 2 April 2007.
4. The works to enable the amalgamation included external fencing and security works, alterations to administrative and staff accommodation and a shared entrance. These works took place during 2007 and 2008. The main works contract was delivered in Summer 2008 with some initial works during 2007. There were some additional costs with regards to the fencing that was provided.
5. The new amalgamated Biggin Hill Primary School became operational from 1 January 2008 following agreement by the Schools' Adjudicator.

	<b>Original Estimate</b>	<b>Tender Estimate (main contract)</b>	<b>Actual Expenditure</b>	<b>Variance (tender – actual)</b>
<b>Biggin Hill Amalgamation – Provision of new modular teaching and administration facilities</b>	<b>£180,000</b>	<b>£98,904</b>	<b>£199,000</b>	<b>£19,000</b>

It was agreed in the report to Executive on 20 July 2011 that the overspend on the project would be met by the 2011/12 Schools' Capital Maintenance Budget.

### Running Costs

6. Running costs for the building are met through the school's devolved budget.

### Scheme Objectives

7. The scheme objective was to support through capital works the amalgamation of Biggin Hill Infant and Biggin Hill Junior school, reducing surplus places and associated costs.

### Assessment of Scheme Success

8. The works enabled the successful amalgamation of the two schools and associated savings in revenue costs that were part of the project business case.

### Assessment of Contract Efficiency

9. Contract period Phase 1: 8 weeks

Start Date: 28 July 2008

Practical Completion: 7 September 2008

Over-run: 0 weeks

### Outstanding Issues and Their Proposed Resolution

10. There are no outstanding issues.