

Record of officer decision

Decision title:	Procurement of technical advice from Haverstock Associates LLP (architects) during the early stage of design development for the Brookfield capital project.
Date of decision:	21 May 2020
Decision maker:	Assistant Director Education, Development and Skills
Authority for delegated decision:	Cabinet decision on 28 th April 2020 to delegate operational decisions to the Assistant Director for Children and Families, subject to financial policy and procedures within the council. Link to decision: https://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=6799 Financial delegated authority for this spend is within the corporate PM's scope.
Ward:	Countywide
Consultation:	Haverstock Associates LLP ("Haverstock") was initially procured in a competitive tendering process following council procurement rules to undertake the project feasibility study. In order to ensure that the design developed for the Brookfield capital improvements meets council expectation for a high quality and compliant specialist school, we are seeking to commission between 5 and 7 days more work from them through a further service request under the terms of their original contract
Decision made:	Request further services from Haverstock under the terms of the existing contract for the provision of a technical advisory service to the Brookfield School capital project for a period of up to seven days during RIBA stage 2 at a daily rate of £720. Total potential cost up to £5,040.
Reasons for decision:	<p>Although there is a possibility that the contract for developing the design, and subsequently the construction contract, will be secured by service providers with experience of developing schools, there are certain specific requirements when providing a school build for children and young people with special educational needs. The guidance document describing the recommended schedule of accommodation is government building bulletin 104 (BB104)</p> <p>The contractor procured to produce the feasibility study, Haverstock, is an architect services firm with a multi-disciplinary team which has significant and long standing experience in developing settings for special needs. They were responsible for advising the government on the development of the BB104 government guidelines, and are also currently working as advisors to the DfE in the implementation of wave 1 of new free special school builds.</p> <p>To ensure that the developed design for the project is aligned to the needs of our SEN pupils at the school and the requirements of the BB104 government guidelines, it is proposed that Haverstock is appointed to undertake up to 7 days work to provide technical advice on behalf of the council to work alongside the contracted design team, once appointed, in the early stages of design development of the scheme. This will support the following –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adherence where possible to the guidance in BB104 • Maximising the current building and focusing on the adjacencies of

	<p>particular rooms so that curriculum delivery and pupil wellbeing is optimized</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting planning for the phasing of the works so that full time education is maintained throughout the life of the project • Ensuring that value for money is achieved, and that the right priorities are retained, if any cost saving needs to be achieved. <p>All of the above will be budget and value for money dependent</p> <p>The council has adopted a County Plan for the period 2020 – 2024. The plan outlines the council’s key priorities. The support to be provided by Haverstock during the development of the design of the Brookfield School capital project will look to meet three of these priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure all children are healthy, safe and inspired to achieve • Protect and improve the lives of vulnerable people • Invest in education and the skills needed by employers.
<p>Highlight any associated risks/finance/legal/equality considerations:</p>	<p>There are no negative implications considered to be associated with agreeing this decision, however there are risks apparent should the decision <u>not</u> be taken to appoint technical advisors.</p> <p>The risks of not taking this decision are outlined below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If specialist advisors are not consulted when developing the design there is a risk that the building will not offer the most effective accommodation for the pupils at the school, who have needs that would not be met by the provision of standard mainstream school accommodation. • The provision of standard school accommodation would not guarantee the appropriate level of health and safety that is essential in the provision of education for children and young people with social emotional and mental health needs (SEMH) • In addition, failure to provide bespoke accommodation specifically suited to SEMH special needs may lead to further cost implications in the future.
<p>Details of any alternative options considered and rejected:</p>	<p>An alternative option would be to not employ any specialist technical advice, but this was rejected on the following grounds;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school buildings have to function efficiently for a highly vulnerable group of children and young people, with particularly challenging special needs • In addition, the project involves maximizing and improving an existing building as well as some new build elements. <p>For these reasons and in order to ensure that the available budget is spent in a focused and best value way, the relatively modest amount of funds required to commission technical support is considered to be a prudent spend.</p>
<p>Details of any declarations of interest made:</p>	<p>If any officers or members involved or consulted in the decision-making have declared an interest you should include the declaration here.</p>