



**Oversight and Governance**

Chief Executive's Department

Plymouth City Council

Ballard House

Plymouth PL1 3BJ

T 01752 305155

[www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy](http://www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy)

Published 28/04/21

## Delegated Decisions

### Delegated Executive/Officer Decisions

Delegated Executive and Officer decisions are published every Wednesday and are available at the following link - <https://tinyurl.com/ms6umor>

Cabinet decisions subject to call-in are published at the following link - <http://tinyurl.com/yddrqll6>

Notice of call-in for non-urgent decisions must be given to the Democratic Support Unit by 4.30 pm on Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> May 2021. Please note – urgent decisions and non-key Council Officer decisions cannot be called in. Copies of the decisions together with background reports are available for viewing as follows:

- on the Council's Intranet Site at <https://modgov/mgDelegatedDecisions.aspx>
- on the Council's website at <https://tinyurl.com/jhnax4e>

The decisions detailed below may be implemented on Friday 7<sup>th</sup> May 2021 if they are not called-in.

## **Delegated Decisions**

### **1. Councillor Evans OBE - The Leader:**

1.1. Plymstock School Additional S106 and Basic Need Funding **(Pages 1 - 8)**

### **2. Kim Brown - Service Director for HR and OD:**

2.1. Corporate Estate Condition Surveys **(Pages 9 - 26)**

# EXECUTIVE DECISION

made by a Cabinet Member




## REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY BY AN INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER

Executive Decision Reference Number – L56 20/21

Decision	
1	<b>Title of decision:</b> Plymstock School additional S106 and Basic Need Funding
2	<b>Decision maker (Cabinet member name and portfolio title):</b> Cllr Tudor Evans OBE, Leader of the Council
3	<b>Report author and contact details:</b> Ian Baker, Investment and Organisational Manager, 01752 307320
4	<b>Decision to be taken:</b> <b>It is recommended that the Leader of the Council:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allocates £580,550 for the project into the Capital Programme funded by £310,317 of S106 and £270,233 of Basic Need funding</li> </ul>
5	<b>Reasons for decision:</b> <p>The original business case was completed in 2018 with the project costs of £2,500,000 of which £2,050,000 was specifically for building works with a contingency of £175,000. The remainder of the original funding was set against the survey, planning and building fees plus the architectural and other consultant fees.</p> <p>Due to the impact of the pandemic, delays have been incurred leading to extension of time together with the increasing costs for materials and specification errors. This has impacted on the overall build costs coupled with changing building completion to meet the school requirements.</p> <p>We currently have a spending shortfall of £580,550, including contingency, with any underspend being returned to the Secondary Basic Need budget.</p> <p>If the works are not completed, the school will not have sufficient dining and hall space and any delays in obtaining the additional funding required for completion will increase costs by £5,000 per week.</p>
6	<b>Alternative options considered and rejected:</b> <p>We have reviewed all options, including:</p> <p>Non-completion of the Arts and Drama Centre, however this would impact the school operationally as they would not be able to fulfil their educational requirements, causing Plymouth to fail in its statutory duty in providing necessary additional pupil places in secondary schools. The school would not be able to support sports and drama activities for all pupils and would be unable to provide sufficient dining space for meal times. This option was rejected.</p> <p>Another alternative was to retender the completion of the Arts and Drama Centre, however this was rejected due to the issues surrounding other contractors' appetite for taking on the work previously partially completed by another contractor. Many of the contractors that specialise in delivering this size</p>

	of contract are still feeling the effect of the pandemic and as a consequence, are risk averse, as their businesses are currently fragile. Even if a contractor did take on the fit out of the Arts and Drama Centre, the derogation of the warranties would also be a potential serious issue. With the current uncertainty in the market, there is also no surety that a new provider would be more cost effective than the current contractor, especially when site set up, mobilisation, familiarisation and procurement of specialist sub-contractors, is also taken into account.			
<b>7</b>	<b>Financial implications:</b> 1. £310,317 S106 contributions as detailed on the update 2. £270,233 Basic Need Grant			
<b>8</b>	<b>Is the decision a Key Decision?</b> (please contact <a href="#">Democratic Support</a> for further advice)	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Per the Constitution, a key decision is one which:</b>  in the case of <b>capital</b> projects and contract awards, results in a new commitment to spend and/or save in excess of <b>£3million</b> in total  in the case of <b>revenue</b> projects when the decision involves entering into new commitments and/or making new savings in excess of <b>£1million</b>  is <b>significant</b> in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising <b>two or more</b> wards in the area of the local authority.
	<b>If yes, date of publication of the notice in the <a href="#">Forward Plan of Key Decisions</a></b>	N/A		
<b>9</b>	<b>Please specify how this decision is linked to the Council's corporate plan/Plymouth Plan and/or the policy framework and/or the revenue/capital budget:</b>	See previous Plymstock School Business Case that was agreed at the Capital Programme Board.		
<b>10</b>	<b>Please specify any direct environmental implications of the decision (carbon impact)</b>	None		
<b>Urgent decisions</b>				
<b>11</b>	<b>Is the decision urgent and to be implemented immediately in the interests of the Council or the public?</b>	<b>Yes</b>		(If yes, please contact Democratic Support ( <a href="mailto:democraticsupport@plymouth.gov.uk">democraticsupport@plymouth.gov.uk</a> ) for advice)
		<b>No</b>	No	<b>(If no, go to section 13a)</b>
<b>12a</b>	<b>Reason for urgency:</b>			

I2b	Scrutiny Chair Signature:		Date	
	Scrutiny Committee name:			
	Print Name:			
<b>Consultation</b>				
I3a	Are any other Cabinet members' portfolios affected by the decision?	Yes		
		No	No	(If no go to section I4)
I3b	Which other Cabinet member's portfolio is affected by the decision?	Councillor Jon Taylor, Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and Transformation		
I3c	Date Cabinet member consulted	Mid March 2021		
I4	Has any Cabinet member declared a conflict of interest in relation to the decision?	Yes		If yes, please discuss with the Monitoring Officer
		No	no	
I5	Which Corporate Management Team member has been consulted?	Name	Ming Zhang / Amanda Paddison	
		Job title	Service Director for Education & Head of Access to Learning	
		Date consulted	19/03/2021	
<b>Sign-off</b>				
I6	Sign off codes from the relevant departments consulted:	Democratic Support (mandatory)	DSI36 20/21	
		Finance (mandatory)	pl.20.21.292	
		Legal (mandatory)	MS/2/32064	
		Human Resources (if applicable)	N/A	
		Corporate property (if applicable)	N/A	
		Procurement (if applicable)	N/A	
<b>Appendices</b>				
I7	Ref.	Title of appendix		
	A	Plymstock School Briefing Report		

<b>Confidential/exempt information</b>							
<b>18a</b>	<b>Do you need to include any confidential/exempt information?</b>	<b>Yes</b>		If yes, prepare a second, confidential ('Part II') briefing report and indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box in <b>18b</b> below.  (Keep as much information as possible in the briefing report that will be in the public domain)			
		<b>No</b>	no				
		<b>Exemption Paragraph Number</b>					
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>18b</b>	<b>Confidential/exempt briefing report title:</b>						
<b>Background Papers</b>							
<b>19</b>	Please list all unpublished, background papers relevant to the decision in the table below.  Background papers are <u>unpublished</u> works, relied on to a material extent in preparing the report, which disclose facts or matters on which the report or an important part of the work is based. If some/all of the information is confidential, you must indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box.						
<b>Title of background paper(s)</b>		<b>Exemption Paragraph Number</b>					
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Cabinet Member Signature</b>							
<b>20</b>	I agree the decision and confirm that it is not contrary to the Council's policy and budget framework, Corporate Plan or Budget. In taking this decision I have given due regard to the Council's duty to promote equality of opportunity, eliminate unlawful discrimination and promote good relations between people who share protected characteristics under the Equalities Act and those who do not. For further details please see the EIA attached.						
<b>Signature</b>				<b>Date of decision</b>		23 April 2021	
<b>Print Name</b>		Cllr Tudor Evans OBE, Leader					

## PLYMSTOCK SCHOOL CAPITAL UPDATE



### Part I Briefing Report

#### 1.0 SCHEME SUMMARY

Secondary Basic Need is the requirement to provide additional pupil places within the city to meet the needs of city's growth. Plymstock School expansion was identified within the Secondary Review. It is a statutory requirement for Plymouth City Council as the Local Education Authority to provide sufficient pupil places to meet the demands of the growing population of the City.

The expansion of Plymstock School, as part of the Secondary Basic Need projects, addresses some of the increased pupil numbers, which are now moving from their primary phase into secondary education. The expansion increases the capacity of the school from 8.6FE (1300 places) to 9.6FE (1450 places), a total of 150 new places.

The project on completion provides a new extension on the MFL building, creating 6 additional classrooms with additional toilet facilities. The project also provides a new Arts and Drama facility which then provides additional assembly, sports and hall space which is a requirement linked to the increase in pupil numbers which is the barest minimum provision which is compliant with the school building bulletins.

The project was originally commissioned by the school in the first instance who obtained the original planning permissions and design pack.

For financial expediency PCC worked initially with the schools appointed consultants and work commenced on the Arts and drama block.

The Arts and Drama block was partially complete when the Pandemic caused the first lockdown and work was suspended for 13 weeks causing a delay on construction, 27/3/20 – 1/7/20, whilst the contractor was furloughed.

Due to the school taking additional pupils to assist PCC. Four temps were required to facilitate the necessary classroom space. The hire period had to be extended due to the Pandemic.

If no mitigating action had been taken the hire period for the temps would have significantly increased in time and cost.

To mitigate this it was decided to cease works on the Arts and Drama block and mothball this until after the delivery of the MFL class spaces, urgently required due to the pandemic constraints on space. To this end the works were reprogrammed and the MFL block is now nearing completion allowing the removal of the temporary units reducing the ongoing financial impacts on the project.

As the pandemic progressed it became apparent that the project was falling into delay.

During the delivery of the MFL several design faults were discovered and errors in the Bill of quantities further compounded this. This as required additional design input and increased the costs associated to the errors in the design and bill attributed to the original consultants appointed by the school, who PCC have removed and the project taken in house to minimise further costs and risks.

During the construction of the MFL block, we have engineered the mothballed Arts and Drama block and have identified a deliverable scheme to complete this final element of the overall project. PCC have had to incur additional design costs along with programme delays, additional construction costs and Covid-19 impacts and prolongation.

Taking into account the pandemic, delays due to the original consultant's errors and omissions and vast discrepancies in the bill of quantities, we have a spending shortfall of £580,550, including contingency, with any underspend being returned to the Secondary Basic Need budget.

PCC have requested a contribution from the Trust, which is ongoing. Any contribution made by the Trust will be deducted from the sum of £580,550 as indicated above, and will be returned to the Secondary Basic Need budget.

EPS have worked with Project Services and Finance to identify the necessary SI06 Income strands to complete the project

The budget summary is as below

## 2.0 BUDGET SUMMARY AND BUSINESS CASE

The original business case was completed in 2018 with the project costs of £2,500,000 of which £2,050,000 was specifically for building works with a contingency of £175,000. The remainder of the original funding was set against the survey, planning and building fees plus the architectural and other consultant fees.

Due to the impact of the pandemic, delays have been incurred leading to extension of time together with the increasing costs for materials and specification errors. This has impacted on the overall build costs coupled with changing building completion to meet the school requirements.

Planning Application	Amount	Spend Expiry	Received
06/01646/OUT	£ 111,869.36	01/07/2023	02/07/2018
07/00116/FUL	£ 45,000.00		06/06/2014
09/01443/FUL	£ 10,145.62	10/11/2029	11/11/2014
12/01304/FUL	£ 126,075.67	27/07/2021	18/08/2017
12/01867/FUL	£ 5,483.47		11/07/2018
13/00211/FUL	£ 5,105.20	27/08/2029	28/04/2014
13/00349/FUL	£ 6,638.21	11/07/2033	11/07/2018
<b>SI06 Total</b>	<b>£310,317</b>		
<b>Basic Need Grant</b>	<b>£270,233</b>		
<b>Total Addition to Programme</b>	<b>£580,550</b>		

Work will continue to review other SI06 funding contributions that may be available which will consequently reduce the value of the Basic Need Grant required.



### 3.0 REVENUE IMPLICATIONS

There are no known revenue implications from this scheme.

### 4.0 RISKS

We currently have an incomplete scheme that does not allow the school to operate effectively with the additional pupil numbers.

We compromise our strong relationship with the Trust

We continue incurring ongoing delay costs of circa £5k per week

Material and construction costs are inflating due to the delays

We need the additional school places to fulfil our statutory obligation as the LEA

We have expended significant funds on the project which is currently incomplete

If we do not proceed we could lose the Trust funding contribution to complete the scheme

If we do not complete the scheme we could find ourselves in dispute with both the Trust and the contractors.

If the contractor does not complete the works it would be very difficult to identify another contractor willing to undertake the remaining works to completion

If the scheme is completed by a third party the warranties would be affected

We do not have 100% price certainty, however we have taken all possible steps to quantify the overall outturn cost and minimise the final costs, although the cost will increase further for every week of delay

The risks due to design issues and Bill of Quantity errors have been reviewed in order to mitigate the ongoing financial risk

Reputational loss is also a considerable risk although the scheme issues are not attributable to PCC

Adequate contingency has been included to complete the project

As the Arts and Drama block shell and first fix is now complete, all of the major risk items regarding construction have been mitigated and we now have low residual risk in this respect to completion

The design is now deliverable and the construction elements have been re-costed to deliver the best cost certainty possible in order to complete the scheme whilst mitigating potential risk

A design review has minimised the design risk and errors identified by PCC

The Trust are working very closely with PCC and there is a strong working relationship between both parties, the Trust are also undertaking some of the additional costs as they recognise that PCC have inherited a legacy from the school that was initiated prior to the school becoming part of the Trust. The completion of the scheme is reliant upon the support of the Trust continuing.

### 5.0 RECOMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Leader of the Council:

- Approves this briefing paper
- Approves an increase to the capital programme of £580,550 for the Plymstock School Basic Need project, financed by:

- £310,317 S106 contributions as detailed above
- £270,233 Basic Need Grant

# EXECUTIVE DECISION

## made by a Council Officer



### REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY BY AN INDIVIDUAL COUNCIL OFFICER

Executive Decision Reference Number – COD22 20/21

Decision				
1	<b>Title of decision:</b> Corporate Estate Condition Surveys			
2	<b>Decision maker (Council Officer name and job title):</b> Kim Brown – Service Director for HR and OD			
3	<b>Report author and contact details:</b> Dan Williams and Ralph Bint <a href="mailto:Daniel.Williams@plymouth.gov.uk">Daniel.Williams@plymouth.gov.uk</a> <a href="mailto:Ralph.Bint@plymouth.gov.uk">Ralph.Bint@plymouth.gov.uk</a>			
4a	<b>Decision to be taken:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves the Business Case</li> <li>Authorises the procurement process.</li> <li>Delegates the award of the contract to Facilities Manager – Ralph Bint</li> </ul>			
4b	<b>Reference number of original executive decision or date of original committee meeting where delegation was made:</b> N/A			
5	<b>Reasons for decision:</b> To provide reliable data on the condition of the corporate estate.			
6	<b>Alternative options considered and rejected:</b> Do nothing – leaves PCC with lack of data on condition of estate			
7	<b>Financial implications:</b> £180k for the project to be funded by capital receipts. This will require initial funding as the capital receipt will only follow in time. Capital approved by Brendan Arnold – Service Director for Finance			
8	<b>Is the decision a Key Decision?</b> (please contact <a href="#">Democratic Support</a> for further advice)	<b>Yes</b>   	<b>No</b> X	<b>Per the Constitution, a key decision is one which:</b>  in the case of <b>capital</b> projects and contract awards, results in a new commitment to spend and/or save in excess of <b>£3million</b> in total

			X	in the case of <b>revenue</b> projects when the decision involves entering into new commitments and/or making new savings in excess of <b>£1 million</b>
			X	is <b>significant</b> in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising <b>two or more</b> wards in the area of the local authority.
8b	If yes, date of publication of the notice in the <b>Forward Plan of Key Decisions</b>			
9	Please specify how this decision is linked to the Council's corporate plan/Plymouth Plan and/or the policy framework and/or the revenue/capital budget:		Caring and Fair. Ensuring the corporate estate is well maintained correctly to ensure best value for money for tax payer.	
10	Please specify any direct environmental implications of the decision (carbon impact)		No direct implications.	


#### Urgent decisions

11	Is the decision urgent and to be implemented immediately in the interests of the Council or the public?	Yes		(If yes, please contact <b>Democratic Support</b> for advice)
		No	x	(If no, go to section 13a)
12a	Reason for urgency:			
12b	Scrutiny Chair signature:		Date	
	Scrutiny Committee name:			
	Print Name:			

#### Consultation

13a	Are any other Cabinet members' portfolios affected by the decision?	Yes	X	
		No		(If no go to section 14)
13b	Which other Cabinet member's portfolio is affected by the decision?	Councillor Mark Lowry (Cabinet Member for Finance)		
13c	Date Cabinet member consulted	December 2020		
14	Has any Cabinet member declared a	Yes		If yes, please discuss with the

	<b>conflict of interest in relation to the decision?</b>	<b>No</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Monitoring Officer				
15	<b>Which Corporate Management Team member has been consulted?</b>	<b>Name</b>		Andy Ralphs				
		<b>Job title</b>		Strategic Director Customer and Corporate Services				
		<b>Date consulted</b>		19 Jan 2021				
<b>Sign-off</b>								
16	<b>Sign off codes from the relevant departments consulted:</b>	<b>Democratic Support (mandatory)</b>			DS128 20/21			
		<b>Finance (mandatory)</b>			pl.20.21.292.			
		<b>Legal (mandatory)</b>			MS/26.04.21			
		<b>Human Resources (if applicable)</b>			N/A			
		<b>Corporate property (if applicable)</b>			N/A Author			
		<b>Procurement (if applicable)</b>						
<b>Appendices</b>								
17	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Title of appendix</b>						
	A	Business Case						
	B	Equalities Impact Assessment						
<b>Confidential/exempt information</b>								
18a	<b>Do you need to include any confidential/exempt information?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, prepare a second, confidential ('Part II') briefing report and indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box in <b>18b</b> below.				
		<b>No</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
		<b>Exemption Paragraph Number</b>						
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
18b	<b>Confidential/exempt briefing report title:</b>							
<b>Background Papers</b>								
19	<p>Please list all unpublished, background papers relevant to the decision in the table below.</p> <p>Background papers are <u>unpublished</u> works, relied on to a material extent in preparing the report, which disclose facts or matters on which the report or an important part of the work is based. If some/all of the information is confidential, you must indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part I of</p>							

Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box.								
Title of background paper(s)		Exemption Paragraph Number						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Council Officer Signature</b>								
20	I agree the decision and confirm that it is not contrary to the Council's policy and budget framework, Corporate Plan or Budget. In taking this decision I have given due regard to the Council's duty to promote equality of opportunity, eliminate unlawful discrimination and promote good relations between people who share protected characteristics under the Equalities Act and those who do not. For further details please see the EIA attached.							
<b>Signature</b>				<b>Date of decision</b>		28/04/2021		
<b>Print Name</b>		Kim Brown						

# CAPITAL INVESTMENT BUSINESS CASE

Corporate Estate Condition Surveys



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*The Executive Summary is a short summary of the Business Case and should be the last section you complete, this will enable you to extract or only the key facts from relevant sections i.e. 'project on a page'. The summary is a 'snapshot' of the business case which will need to tell the story and sell the proposal.*

### Current Situation

Lack of condition surveys for the corporate estate

The risks presented by this are:

- The council is unaware of its backlog maintenance position
- General condition ratings of buildings are out of date
- Maintenance is not being prioritised based on condition meaning funding is not targeted
- Decisions are not being made on whether to keep or released a building based on its condition score
- Issues identified in condition surveys are not given a high enough priority and eventually deteriorate into bigger issues requiring capital expenditure with a high level of borrowing currently owed by the Facilities Management team
- Lack of information and high costs of maintaining unoccupied buildings

### Proposal

Procure fast programme of condition surveys to be completed on corporate estate

Condition surveys will provide:

- Data of significant maintenance issues and associated budget costs
- Priority rating for the above
- An overall condition rating for the property
- Allow decisions to be made on what to retain and what to find other use for (see non-financial benefit section)
- Allow a long term maintenance plan to be developed as part of a wider asset management plan. This will allow targeted maintenance plans for the high priority buildings (in terms of condition and use I.E Ballard House, Council House)
- Allow identification of assets suitable for 'Community Asset Transfer'

### Recommended Decision

**It is recommended that the Service Director for HR & OD:**

- Approves the Business Case
- Authorises the procurement process.
- Delegates the award of the contract to Facilities Manager – Ralph Bint

## SECTION I: PROJECT DETAIL

<b>Project Value</b> (indicate capital or revenue)	£180k inc. contingency	<b>Contingency</b> (show as £ and % of project value)	- 20%
<b>Programme</b>	Building Maintenance	<b>Directorate</b>	Transformation & Change
<b>Portfolio Holder</b>	Cllr Mark Lowry, Finance	<b>Service Director</b>	Kim Brown

<b>Senior Responsible Officer (client)</b>	Ralph Bint	<b>Project Manager</b>	FM Team
<b>Address and Post Code</b>	Citywide	<b>Ward</b>	Citywide
<b>Current Situation:</b> <i>(Provide a brief, concise paragraph outlining the current situation and explain the current business need, problem, opportunity or change of circumstances that needs to be resolved)</i>			
<p>Best practice (e.g RICS) shows that general condition surveys on a corporate estate should take place every five years. The council has conducted condition surveys on the majority of our estate however the majority of these are much older than the five year recommendation with only 29 being complete since 2017. The risks presented by this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The council is unaware of its backlog maintenance position</li> <li>• General condition ratings of buildings are out of date</li> <li>• Maintenance is not being prioritised based on condition meaning funding is not targeted</li> <li>• Decisions are not being made on whether to keep or released a building based on its condition score</li> <li>• Issues identified in condition surveys are not given a high enough priority and eventually deteriorate into bigger issues requiring capital expenditure with a high level of borrowing currently owed by the Facilities Management team</li> </ul>			
<b>Proposal:</b> <i>(Provide a brief, concise paragraph outlining your scheme and explain how the business proposal will address the current situation above or take advantage of the business opportunity) and (What would happen if we didn't proceed with this scheme?)</i>			
<p>The proposal is to procure a programme of condition surveys across the corporately occupied estate. Redacting listed properties and a few anomaly structures there are circa 180 properties which are either occupied by PCC (wholly or partly), used to deliver services by partner agencies (Children Centres) or maintained by PCC but used by third parties (changing rooms, bowling pavilions).</p> <p>Condition surveys will provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data of significant maintenance issues and associated budget costs</li> <li>• Priority rating for the above</li> <li>• An overall condition rating for the property</li> <li>• Allow decisions to be made on what to retain and what to find other use for (see non-financial benefit section)</li> <li>• Allow a long term maintenance plan to be developed as part of a wider asset management plan. This will allow targeted maintenance plans for the high priority buildings (in terms of condition and use I.E Ballard House, Council House)</li> <li>• Allow identification of assets suitable for 'Community Asset Transfer'</li> </ul>			

**Milestones and Date:**

Contract Award Date	Start On Site Date	Completion Date
TBC pending framework discovery	ASAP	End 2021

**SECTION 2: PROJECT RISK, OUTCOMES AND BENEFITS**



**Risk Register:** The Risk Register/Risk Log is a master document created during the early stages of a project. It includes information about each identified risk, level of risk, who owns it and what measures are in place to mitigate the risks (cut and paste more boxes if required).

Potential Risks Identified			Likelihood	Impact	Overall Rating
Risk			Low	Low	Low
Mitigation			Low	Low	Low
Calculated risk value in £ (Extent of financial risk)	£0				

### Outcomes and Benefits

**List the outcomes and benefits expected from this project.**

(An **outcome** is the result of the change derived from using the project's deliverables. This section should describe the anticipated outcome)

(A **benefit** is the measurable improvement resulting from an outcome that is perceived as an advantage. Benefits are the expected value to be delivered by the project, measurable whenever possible)

Financial outcomes and benefits:	Non-financial outcomes and benefits:
Long term benefit of maintenance prioritisation prevent leakage completing unnecessary repairs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data on cost of maintaining the retained estate</li> <li>• Backlog maintenance identified and prioritised</li> <li>• Reduction of maintenance requests</li> <li>• Identification of buildings appropriate for community asset transfer</li> </ul>

### Low Carbon

What is the anticipated impact of the proposal on carbon emissions	N/A
How does it contribute to the Council becoming Carbon neutral by 2030	Improve maintenance strategy for the council adopting a fabric first approach to carbon reduction.
Have you engaged with Procurement Service.	Yes
Procurement route options considered for goods, services or works	<p>The value for this requirement is £180k which also includes a contingency which sits below the current threshold of £189,330.00, procurement options are as follows:-</p> <p>Below Threshold Tender Process Overview: For contracts valued below the OJEU threshold requires a process compliant with Contract Standing Orders.</p> <p>Key Information: Either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Invite a minimum of 3 suppliers to submit tenders (one stage process) OR</li> <li>- Advertise the opportunity nationally allowing any supplier to submit a tender (one or two stage depending on timescales and market interest)</li> </ul> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maximum flexibility e.g. advertise or not, not set timescales, no set questions. Tailor to our exact requirements</li> <li>- Inviting suppliers:</li> <li>- Select known suppliers (confidence to deliver)</li> </ul>

- More accurately calculate procurement timescales (known quantity)
  - Streamline the process (one stage)
  - National advertisement:
  - increases level of competition (potential to reduce costs and increase innovation)
- Cons:
- Maximum flexibility= longer to prepare documents
  - Inviting suppliers:
  - reduce potential level of competition (set number of suppliers)
  - Missed opportunity to engage with unknown suppliers
  - Need to assess supplier suitability (unlike framework)
  - National advertisement:
  - May need to undertake 2 stage process if market saturated= longer timescales
  - Unknown quantity to evaluate (tenders if 1 stage, SQs if 2 stage)
  - Need to assess supplier suitability (unlike framework) + more stringently due to unknown suppliers

An assessment of the available Public Sector frameworks available to the Council was carried out by PCCs procurement team due to the tight timescales, those assessed:

#### Procure Partnerships Framework:

##### Pros:

- The framework has followed a robust procurement process and is fully compliant with Public Contract Regulations 2015
- Supplier suitability already assessed- (no need to undertake SQ stage and know suppliers are suitable)
- Terms and conditions already agreed
- Framework provider support
- Direct award or Mini Competition
- No fees to PCC to use (a flat fee of £250 to the winning supplier (max))

##### Cons:

- Direct Award reduces competition
- Set procedures and other key documentation such as T&Cs reduces ability for PCC to tailor to our exact requirements/ some things may not readily fit into current contract
- Risk of supplier challenge- why are we not competing to open market? =reputational damage
- Using a framework reduces the potential level of competition compared to open market- (set suppliers)
- Framework fee charged to suppliers will be built into tender price
- Missed opportunity to engage with unknown suppliers

The following additional frameworks were also investigated but were proven to be unsuitable:

	<p>ESPO 676 – Total Facilities Management Solutions – Currently expired and out to the market, should be live and available around April 2021, currently no visibility of the framework.</p> <p>NHS/SBS/8874 – Hard Facilities Management – On investigating, this framework is for the provision of FM and not consultancy.</p> <p>NHS/SBS/9256 – Construction Consultancy Services 2 – This framework has multiple disciplines e.g. Surveyors (Lot 4), Multi-Disciplinary (Lot 12).</p>
<b>Procurements Recommended route.</b>	Recommendation is to run competition against Procurement Partnership Framework splitting the requirement into three smaller lots (Large, Medium and Small buildings based on Gross Internal Area)
<b>Who is your Procurement Lead.</b>	Kim Kingdom
<b>Which Members have you engaged with and how have they been consulted (including the Leader, Portfolio Holders and Ward Members)</b>	Councillor Mark Lowry (Cabinet Member for Finance) briefed.

#### SECTION 4: FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT

**FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT** : In this section the robustness of the proposals should be set out in financial terms. The Project Manager will need to work closely with the capital and revenue finance teams to ensure that these sections demonstrate the affordability of the proposals to the Council as a whole.

##### CAPITAL COSTS AND FINANCING

Breakdown of project costs including fees surveys and contingency	Prev. Yr. £m	20/21 £m	21/22 £m	22/23 £m	23/24 £m	24/25 £m	Future Yrs. £m	Total £m
Surveys			£180k					
<b>Total capital spend</b>			<b>£180k</b>					

##### Provide details of proposed funding: Funding to match with Project Value

Breakdown of proposed funding	Prev. Yr. £m	20/21 £m	21/22 £m	22/23 £m	23/24 £m	24/25 £m	Future Yrs. £m	Total £m
Corporate Capital			£180k					
<b>Total funding</b>			<b>£180k</b>					

<b>Which external funding sources been explored</b>	N/A
<b>Are there any bidding constraints and/or any restrictions</b>	N/A

<b>or conditions attached to your funding</b>	
<b>Tax and VAT implications</b>	VAT payable on consultancy/ professional fees.
<b>Tax and VAT reviewed by</b>	Sarah Scott

### REVENUE COSTS AND IMPLICATIONS

#### *Cost of Developing the Capital Project (To be incurred at risk to Service area)*

<b>Total Cost of developing the project</b>	NIL
<b>Revenue cost code for the development costs</b>	NIL
<b>Revenue costs incurred for developing the project are to be included in the capital total, some of the expenditure could be capitalised if it meets the criteria</b>	N
<b>Budget Managers Name</b>	Ralph Bint

#### *Ongoing Revenue Implications for Service Area*

			Prev. Yr.	20/21 £	21/22 £	22/23 £	23/24 £	23/24 £	Future Yrs.
Service area revenue cost									
Other (eg: maintenance, utilities, etc)									
Loan repayment (terms agreed with Treasury Management)									
Total Revenue Cost (A)					0	0			
Service area revenue benefits/savings									
Annual revenue income (eg: rents, etc)					0	0			
Total Revenue Income (B)					0	0			
Service area net (benefit) cost (B-A)					0	0			
Has the revenue cost been budgeted for or would this make a revenue pressure									
Which cost centre would the revenue pressure be shown			Has this been reviewed by the budget manager				Y/N		
Name of budget manager			Ralph Bint						
Loan value	£	Interest Rate	%	Term Years		Annual Repayment	£		
Revenue code for annual repayments									

<b>Service area or corporate borrowing</b>	
<b>Revenue implications reviewed by</b>	



**Version Control:** *(The version control table must be updated and signed off each time a change is made to the document to provide an audit trail for the revision and update of draft and final versions)*

<b>Author of Business Case</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Document Version</b>	<b>Reviewed By</b>	<b>Date</b>
Dan Williams	15/01/2021	v 1.0	K Brown	00/00/2021
Dan Williams	01/02/2021	v 2.0		00/00/2021

**SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATION AND ENDORSEMENT****Recommended Decision**

**It is recommended that the Service Director for HR & OD:**

- Approves the Business Case
- Authorises the procurement process.
- Delegates the award of the contract to Facilities Manager – Ralph Bint

<b>[Name, Portfolio]</b>		<b>Service Director</b>	
<b>Either email dated:</b>	<i>date</i>	<b>Either email dated:</b>	<i>15/03/2021</i>
<b>Or signed:</b> 		<b>Signed:</b> 	
<b>Date: 17/03/2021</b>		<b>Date: 17/03/2021</b>	

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Corporate Estate – Condition Surveys



**STAGE 1: What is being assessed and by whom?**

What is being assessed - including a brief description of aims and objectives?

**Current Situation**

Lack of condition surveys for the corporate estate

The risks presented by this are:

The council is unaware of its backlog maintenance position

General condition ratings of buildings are out of date

Maintenance is not being prioritised based on condition meaning funding is not targeted

Decisions are not being made on whether to keep or released a building based on its condition score

Issues identified in condition surveys are not given a high enough priority and eventually deteriorate into bigger issues requiring capital expenditure with a high level of borrowing currently owed by the Facilities Management team

Lack of information and high costs of maintaining unoccupied buildings

**Proposal**

Procure fast programme of condition surveys to be completed on corporate estate

Condition surveys will provide:

	<p>Data of significant maintenance issues and associated budget costs</p> <p>Priority rating for the above</p> <p>An overall condition rating for the property</p> <p>Allow decisions to be made on what to retain and what to find other use for (see non-financial benefit section)</p> <p>Allow a long term maintenance plan to be developed as part of a wider asset management plan. This will allow targeted maintenance plans for the high priority buildings (in terms of condition and use I.E Ballard House, Council House)</p> <p>Allow identification of assets suitable for 'Community Asset Transfer'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Responsible Officer	Ralph Bint, Facilities Manager (Hard Services)
Department and Service	Facilities Management, Finance
Date of Assessment	22/02/2021



STAGE 2: Evidence and Impact				
Protected Characteristics (Equality Act)	Evidence and information (e.g. data and feedback)	Any adverse impact?	Actions	Timescale and who is responsible?
Age	<p>The 2011 Census data % of Population is: -</p> <p>0-4 years – 6%</p> <p>5-9 years - 5%</p> <p>10-14 - 5%</p> <p>15-19 - 7%</p> <p>20-24 - 10%</p> <p>25-29 - 7%</p> <p>30-34 - 6%</p> <p>35-39 - 6%</p> <p>40-44 - 7%</p> <p>45-49 - 7%</p> <p>50-54 - 6%</p> <p>55-59 - 5%</p> <p>60-64 - 6%</p> <p>65-69 - 5%</p> <p>70-74 - 4%</p> <p>75-79 - 3%</p> <p>80-84 - 2%</p> <p>85+ - 3%</p>	No adverse impacts are anticipated.	There are no specific actions necessary for the project based upon the age profile of our customers.	Ralph Bint Facilities Manager March 2021 through December 2021
Disability	<p>30,000 people in Plymouth will have some form of Mental Health issue.</p> <p>0.8% (2118) of those registered with a GP are listed on the mental health register.</p> <p>A total of 31,164 people declared themselves as having a</p>	No adverse impacts are anticipated.	Monitor and review as necessary and appropriate	Ralph Bint Facilities Manager March 2021 through December 2021

	<p>long-term health problem or disability in the 2011 Census.</p> <p>1,224 adults currently registered with a GP in Plymouth have some form of a Learning Disability.</p>			
Faith, Religion or Belief	<p>Data shows that 32.9% of the Plymouth population stated they had no religion.</p> <p>Hindu, Buddhist, Jewish and Sikh combined totalled less than 1%.</p> <p>0.5% of the population had a current religion that was not Christian, Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism, Judaism, or Sikh such as Paganism or Spiritualism.</p>	No adverse impacts are anticipated.	Monitor and review as necessary and appropriate	<p>Ralph Bint</p> <p>Facilities Manager</p> <p>March 2021 through December 2021</p>
Gender - including marriage, pregnancy and maternity	<p>Citywide data shows that overall 50.6% of our population are women; this reflects the national figure of 50.8%.</p>	No adverse impacts are anticipated.	Monitor and review as necessary and appropriate	<p>Ralph Bint</p> <p>Facilities Manager</p> <p>March 2021 through December 2021</p>
Gender Reassignment	<p>National figures (ONS 2013) indicate that up to 10,000 people have gone through this process, with 23 known cases in Plymouth.</p>	No adverse impacts are anticipated.	Monitor and review as necessary and appropriate	<p>Ralph Bint</p> <p>Facilities Manager</p> <p>March 2021 through December 2021</p>
Race	<p>92.9% of Plymouth's population is White British</p> <p>7.1% are Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) with White Other (2.7%), Chinese (0.5%) and</p>	No adverse impacts are anticipated.	Monitor and review as necessary and appropriate	<p>Ralph Bint</p> <p>Facilities Manager</p> <p>March 2021 through December 2021</p>

	<p>Other Asian (0.5%) the most common.</p> <p>The Council has 4.1% BME employees across its workforce.</p> <p>We have a rapidly rising BME population which has doubled since the 2001 census.</p>			
Sexual Orientation -including Civil Partnership	<p>There is no precise local data on numbers of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual (LGB) people in Plymouth, but it is nationally estimated at between 5 – 7%. This would mean that approx. 12,500 people aged over 16 in Plymouth are LGB.</p>	No adverse impacts anticipated.	Monitor and review as necessary and appropriate	<p>Ralph Bint Facilities Manager March 2021 through December 2021</p>

STAGE 3: Are there any implications for the following? If so, please record 'Actions' to be taken		
Local Priorities	Implications	Timescale and who is responsible?
Reduce the inequality gap, particularly in health between communities.	Not at this stage	
Good relations between different communities (community cohesion).	Not at this stage	
Human Rights	Not at this stage	

STAGE 5: Publication			
Director, Assistant Director/Head of Service approving EIA.	Kim Brown Service Director HR and OD	Date	28/04/21