



Leicester
City Council

WARDS AFFECTED
All Wards

FORWARD TIMETABLE OF CONSULTATION AND MEETINGS:

CYP Scrutiny meeting
Cabinet

Wednesday 25 November 2009
Monday 30 November 2009

Proposal for improvements to kitchens and dining facilities in several Primary and Secondary Schools

Report of the Strategic Director, Children

1. Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to:

- 1.1 Request approval for the addition of kitchen and dining refurbishment projects to the Capital Programme.
- 1.2 Demonstrate the strong links between this part of the Council's Children's Capital programme (school kitchen and dining improvement grant and the key priority to narrow the well-being gap by providing healthy meals for children prepared on school sites, wherever possible.
- 1.3 Evidence how, the chosen procurement route and integrated project plans will ensure the maximum possible value for money.

2. Summary

- 2.1 The Children and Young Peoples Services (CYPS) Capital Programme 2009-10 to 2011-12 Report (March 2009) included funding of £1.160m for kitchen and dining improvements. In June 2009 the Council secured a further £3.267m of capital funding from the DCSF to improve the kitchen and dining facilities within several schools. The main purpose of the DCSF funding is to increase the uptake of hot healthy meals and to improve the dining environment in schools. This report set outs the proposals for the allocation of this funding which are in line with the Investing in our Children Priority of narrowing the well-being gap.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 Cabinet is recommended to:

- a. Authorise the proposed capital kitchen improvement works and approve the addition of schemes relating to Block C of the Council's Capital Programme, detailed within paragraph 4.9 and Table 3;
- b. Approve the release of the £0.5m of funding within "Block C" of the CYPS capital programme approved by Cabinet and Council in March 2009;
- c. Approve the addition of the additional associated funding to the Capital Programme - being £2.58m of DCSF grant; £1.125m of BSF match funding; and £0.205m to be contributed by schools from their Devolved Formula Capital allocations; and
- d. Note that a further report will be brought concerning the scheme(s) to be funded from the remaining DCSF grant of £0.688m.

4. Report

- 4.1. The DCSF announced in October 2008 capital grants of £100m nationally for investment in kitchens and dining facilities within Schools. The criteria and conditions of the funding are listed below:
 - a) Increasing the up take of free school meals
 - b) Increasing the overall uptake of school meals
 - c) Improving the quality of food on offer
 - d) Increasing the seating capacity of dining areas
 - e) Improving the dining environment and providing social spaces inside and outside
 - f) Decreasing queuing time
 - g) Innovative approaches for the eating experience
 - h) The Council must provide 50% match funding
 - i) The funding must be expended by August 2011.
- 4.2 The main criteria of the funding is to increase the uptake of school meals, which can be best achieved through improvements to existing facilities rather than building a limited number of brand new kitchen facilities. The funding criteria relating to 50% match funding and time line for expenditure limits the number and scope of projects that can be completed. The focus of the feasibility was to identify schools with existing servery kitchens, which could be converted into full service kitchens and the refurbishment and extension of existing full service kitchens. The match funding of 50% and the time line for completion also meant that schools within the Building Schools for the Future programme and Primary Capital Programme (PCP) were considered in the feasibility process.
- 4.3 Increased uptake of hot meals, in particular free school meals is the main priority of the DCSF funding. For many children a free school meal is their only opportunity for a hot balanced meal in the day. Studies show that a nice environment with the time to eat and enjoy a hot meal is beneficial to pupils overall health and well being and also improves pupils attainment in afternoon lessons. Hot meals provide a wide variety of ingredients and the opportunity to try new food, whereas the quality and variety within pack-ups may be poor. The six projects show a 2,227 potential increase in the uptake of school meals. (see appendix A)

- 4.4 Appendix A to the report lists the schools considered and states the reasons why the schools were either put forward to the DCSF as a potential project or discounted at that stage. At the end of December 2008 the Council submitted a bid for £6.473m, which consisted of proposals for 12 potential projects, 2 secondary schools and 10 Primary Schools.
- 4.5 The Government received over £200m of bids from local authorities and in the end of May 2009 allocated £3.267m to Leicester City Council, which is half of the amount of the original bid. The decision of which projects in the original bid that should not be carried out was delegated by the DCSF to the Council.
- 4.6 In June 2009 the Council submitted the revised plans to the DCSF (subject to final approval by Cabinet), the details of which can also be found in Appendix A. The revised plan consisted of proposals for 7 projects - 2 secondary schools and 5 primary schools. Of the five primary school projects that were included in the revised plan, one is being processed through the PCP, three are being proposed as part of this report and the fifth is discussed in the next paragraph.
- 4.7 Although the revised plan submitted to the DCSF for primary schools included Alderman Richard Hallam Primary School, a possible alternative project is Overdale Infant and Junior Schools. The latter is ranked fourth under the prioritisation matrix detailed in Appendix B, ahead of Alderman Richard Hallam, however it requires more funding than is available. It is suggested that neither school should proceed at present, until the actual costs of the other schools are known and the funding remaining for the fifth primary school can be more accurately quantified. A further report will be brought to Cabinet at that time.
- 4.8 Appendix B of the report details the matrix that has been used to prioritise the schools, which considers the condition of the existing kitchens, deprivation, number of potential free school meals, number of overall potential to take up a school meal and value for money. The table 1 below summarises the results of the prioritisation matrix.

Table 1 – The results of the prioritisation matrix

Name of Primary School	Ranking	Potential increase in the uptake of free school meals
Woodstock Primary School	First	611
Northfields House Primary School	Second	371
Merrydale Infant and Junior Schools	Third	332
Overdale Infant and Junior Schools	Fourth	241
Alderman Richard Hallam Primary School	Fifth	152

- 4.9 The funding available for this current kitchen programme totals £5.759m and consists of a carry forward of surplus capital funds from a previous round of kitchen works, Building

Schools for the Future funds, Primary Capital Programme funds and schools' Devolved Formula Capital. This is set out in Table 2 below.

Table 2 - Funding Available for Improvements to School Kitchen and Dining Facilities

Source	Amount
DCSF Grant	£3.268m
BSF match funding	£1.125m
Allocation in Capital Programme for kitchens (£0.5m in Block A and £0.5m in Block C)	£1.000m
Unallocated funding from previous kitchen programme	£0.160m
School Contributions from Devolved Formula Capital	£0.205m
Total Funding Available	£5.759m

Table 3 below shows the projects proposed to make up this current improvement programme, in accordance with the plans and prioritisation criteria referred to above. It includes the projects approved previously under Block A of the CYPS Capital Programme Report (March 2009) and sets out the projects proposed to be added to the Capital Programme under this Cabinet paper (Block C). It should be noted that estimated costs for each project are based upon a desktop study rather than full feasibility studies on site. It will be noted that firm proposals are made for £5.071m of the available funding, and that proposals for the balance of £0.688m will be brought forward at a later date as described in para. 4.6 above.

Table 3 – Proposed Kitchen and Dining Facilities Improvement Programme

School	Brief description of work	Approximate cost of works	Block A (approved) or Block C (proposed)
Rushey Mead School (BSF)	New kitchen and extend dining area	£1.093m	Block A
Crown Hills Community College (BSF)	New kitchen and extend dining area	£1.156m	Block A
Marriott Primary (Primary Capital Programme)	New fully functional kitchen off hall	£0.150m	Block A
Northfields House Primary	New fully functional kitchen off hall	£1.073m	Block C
Woodstock Primary	Refurbish and extend current provision, inc. food tech room	£0.943m	Block C
Merrydale Inf & Jun	Refurbish and extend current provision, inc. food tech room	£0.656m	Block C
Total Funds to be Allocated at this Stage		£5.071m	

Funds to be Allocated Later	Proposed as either Alderman Richard Hallam or Overdale Infant and Junior	£0.688m	
Total Funds to be Allocated Overall		£5.759m	

4.10 The designs for the kitchens will be completed in partnership with City Catering and the individual schools. The projects will be procured through either framework contracts such as the East Midlands Property Alliance or through competitive tendering. Either route will ensure that the council secures value for money for the new facilities either by removing the necessity to spend on procurement processes or by maximizing the opportunities available to drive down contract costs due to the favourable economic climate. In some cases it may be possible to carry out the kitchen projects at the same time as another scheme (eg BSF or PCP [Primary Capital Programme] project to minimize disruption to the school and to reduce costs for the council by increasing efficiencies and economies of scale. These measures will also improve environmental sustainability outcomes eg by reducing number of journeys by materials delivery vehicles.

5. FINANCIAL, LEGAL AND OTHER IMPLICATIONS

5.1. Financial Implications

This report is concerned with financial implications throughout. It will be noted that the DCSF grant must be expended by August 2011. The DCSF funding relating to the secondary schools will need to be appropriately linked in with the timelines and accounting arrangements for the Building Schools for the Future programme. No significant on-going revenue implications are envisaged as a result of this capital expenditure, although the cost of increased take-up of free school meals would be chargeable to the Dedicated Schools Grant. - Colin Sharpe, Head of Finance and Efficiency, CYPS, ext. 29 7750.

5.2 Legal Implications

This report has no legal implications from an "Education" perspective. - Kamal Adatia, Team Leader Community Legal Services x29 7044

Legal Services should be consulted about the use of framework contracts and contract terms. - Joanna Bunting, Head of Commercial & Property Law x29 6450

6. Other Implications

OTHER IMPLICATIONS	YES/NO	Paragraph Within Supporting information	References
Equal Opportunities	Yes	Entire report	
Policy	Yes	Entire report	
Sustainable and Environmental	Yes	Entire report	
Crime and Disorder	No		

Human Rights Act	No	
Elderly/People on Low Income	No	

7. Risk Assessment Matrix

Risk	Likelihood L/M/H	Severity Impact L/M/H	Control Actions (if necessary/appropriate)
Market prices too high / supply chain has insufficient capacity	L	M	Procure work through framework contracts with strategic Partnerships. Ensure more than one supply chain.
Delivery of projects on time and within budget	M	M	Ensure proper project management arrangements in place, procure through strategic partnering arrangements
Disruption to schools and temporary downturn in achievement during construction	M	H	Careful pre-planning and liaison with schools. Early involvement of contractors. LA officers to support school leadership during building works.
New kitchen and dining facilities do not improve the meal take up	M	M	Involve stakeholders in building design
Design not suitable to users	L	M	Close engagement with governors, parents,, Teachers, catering staff and pupils during design development.
Local authority has insufficient capacity to deliver	M	H	Adopt appropriate structure and ensure Sufficient financial and human resources.

8. Background Papers – Local Government Act 1972

Not applicable

9. Consultations

City Catering and schools.

10. Report Authors

Jim Bowditch, Interim 0-11 Programme Manager, CYPS Ext 39 1640

Vicki Chapman, Development Officer, Learning Environment, CYPS, Ext 39 1648

Helen Ryan, Service Director, Learning Environment, CYPS, Ext 29 8791

Key Decision	Yes
Reason	Is significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising more than one ward
Appeared in Forward Plan	Yes
Executive or Council Decision	Executive (Cabinet)

Appendix A – Schools which were considered for kitchen works

School	Works required	Socio-economic	PCP ranking	Potential increase in meals	DCSF original Submission Dec 08?	DCSF Revised submission June 09
					No, why? Yes, value £	No, why? Yes, value £
Alderman Richard Hallam Primary	Refurbishment of kitchen and dining due to poor condition	1	71	152	Yes submitted in bid, value £0.607	Yes, £0.607m
Crown Hills	Potential new build school	N/A - BSF	N/A - BSF	358	Yes submitted in bid, value £2.311m	Yes, value £1.156m
Eyres Monsell Primary	In need of refurbishment	3	3	92	Yes submitted in bid, value £0.380m	No, going ahead, through PCP
Forest Lodge Primary	Flat roof & damp	4	5	114	No, a later PCP project, proposed new build	N/A
Humberstone Inf & Jun	Horsa hut, poor condition	2	Inf = 67 Jun = 19	190	Yes submitted in bid, value £1.793m	No, going ahead, funded by current project in the capital programme
Marriott Primary	Currently dining/kitchen mobile accommodation	4	1	77	Yes submitted in bid, value £0.798m	Yes, value £0.150m
Mayflower Primary	In need of refurbishment, poor condition	1	81	206	No, low ranking in PCP, so match funding is not available	N/A
Merrydale Inf & Jun	Horsa hut, poor condition, in need of refurbishment	4	Inf = 20 Jun = 10	332	Yes submitted in bid, value £0.656m	Yes, value £0.656M
Mowmacre Hill Primary	Extending to make if full service kitchen	3	5	78	No, later phase of PCP (scope not defined at this stage) & CLASP construction would make it difficult to extend	N/A
Northfield House Primary	Horsa hut, very poor condition Env' Health considered building not fit for purpose, and in need of replacement asap	3	20	371	Yes submitted in bid, value £1.073m	Yes, value £1.073m
Overdale Inf & Jun	Existing building in very poor condition, in need of refurbishment	1	Inf = 80 Jun = 51	240	Yes submitted in bid value £0.870m	No, due to insufficient funding

Parks Primary	In need of extension to form additional space	2	71	71	No, low ranking in PCP, so match funding is not available	N/A
Rowlatts Hill Primary	In need of refurbishment	4	10	89	Yes submitted in bid , value £0.826m	No, value engineered as part of PCP implementation
Rushey Mead School	Extend & refurb existing kitchen & dining facility	N/A - BSF	N/A - BSF	478	Yes submitted in bid , value £2.187m	Yes, value £1.093m
St Barnabas Primary	Create a full service kitchen, currently a servery	2	41	85	Yes submitted in bid , value £0.502m	No, part of a PCP scheme being developed
Thurnby Lodge Primary	In need of refurbishment, poor condition	1	38	30	No, low ranking in PCP, so no match funding available	N/A
Whitehall Primary	In need of refurbishment, poor condition	1	67	67	No, low ranking in PCP, so no match funding is available	N/A
Woodstock Primary	In need of refurbishment, poor condition	4	13	611	Yes submitted in bid , value £0.943m	Yes, value £0.943m
				Contingency	£0	£0.81m
					TOTAL £12.946m	TOTAL £5.759m

Appendix B – Prioritisation of selected schemes

School	Condition of Building Score:		Deprivation	Potential uptake of free school meals			Potential uptake of meals overall			Aproximate cost	Value for money compared to the potential increase overall for school meals
	A to D	1 to 4		1 to 4	Actual	Potential	Difference	Actual	Potential		
Alderman Richard	C	3	1	52	58	6	142	293.5	151.5	£606,825.00	£4,005.45
Feeder School - N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Merrydale	B	2	4	165	198	33	232	564	332	£655,877.00	£1,975.53
Feeder School - N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Northfield House	C	3	3	90	120	30	106	268	162	£1,073,349.00	£2,893.12
Feeder school - St Patricks	N/A	N/A	3	26	34	8	76	285	209	N/A	N/A
Overdale inf/Jun	B	2	1	22	32	10	171	316.5	145.5	£869,662.00	£3,616.06
Knighton Field Primary	N/A	N/A	2	58	66	8	86	181	95	N/A	N/A
Woodstock	C	3	4	96	129	33	127	288	161	£943,294.00	£1,542.84
Feeder School - M'macre	N/A	N/A	3	53	82	29	70	207	137	N/A	N/A
Feeder School - Wolsey	N/A	N/A	2	74	94	20	114	391	277	N/A	N/A
Feeder School - B.lodge	N/A	N/A	1	44	52	8	65	101.4	36.4	N/A	N/A

SUMMARY	Condition of Building Score:	Deprivation weighted x 2	Potential uptake of free school meals difference weighted x 2	Potential uptake of meals overall difference	Ranked value for money	Total	Results of Prioritisation Matrix
Northfield House	3	12	76	371	3	465	2nd
Woodstock	3	20	180	611.4	5	819.4	1st
Merrydale	2	8	66	332	4	412	3rd
Alderman Richard	3	2	12	151.5	1	169.5	5th
Overdale Inf & Jun	2	6	130	240.5	2	380.5	4th