

Table 1 Summary of Scope

Summary Scope of Phase				
School / Academy	PFI	D&B	Capex	Capex Comments
E-ACT Leeds East Academy	-	100% new build	£16,986,535	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reflects the New Build Roundhouse Concept School as defined in the Options Appraisal and Further options Appraisal 2. The following additional funds are included in the total shown. These were not included on the PfS proforma (Appendix 4b): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LCC authority works budget of £226k • The Project Management Fee Account contribution of £565k to meet the LEP's project management fees. As these fees would have come out of the construction budget, this increases the amount available for the build.

Table 2

Documentation to be provided		LA / PfS PD Commentary	Peer Reviewer Comment
1	Project Risk Register for the delivery of this Phase.	Refer to Appendix 1 – Project Risk Register	Cleared
2	Derogations List applicable to this Phase.	<p>Mike Sturgeon has agreed that (Refer to Appendix 2a - Derogations List (PfS Agreement):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Leeds West Academy (LWA) D&B Contract position, but with the transfer of risk to the LEP on title will be used for E-ACT Leeds East Academy (ELEA). ▪ The derogation table will use LWA Contract as the template, showing the changes from the LWA position. The red line will be provided showing changes against the LWA Contract, including title risk position changes, 	<p>The normal expectation here is that the benchmark derogations be provide with the stage 0 submission.</p> <p>The reviewer has seen the email at appendix 2a and is minded to clear this requirement in to avoid holding up the development of this scheme through the NPAP.</p> <p>Peer Review Note: The LA is reminded that benchmark derogation table should be submitted with future submission.</p> <p>LCC Response: Awaiting clarification from PfS</p> <p>Updated 13.06.2011: Feedback presented to the PfS PD on the 08/06/2011. No action required from the LA.</p>

	Documentation to be provided	LA / PfS PD Commentary	Peer Reviewer Comment
		<p>any gaps and project / site specific items.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The LWA Development Agreement will be used as a baseline document (as opposed to the 2010 version). ▪ As agreed for the D&B Contract, the derogation table will use the LWA Development Agreement as the template, showing the changes from the LWA position. The red line will be provided showing changes against the LWA document. <p>The LEP have also agreed to the above (Refer to Appendix 2b - Derogations List (LEP Agreement)).</p>	
3	Programme for the Delivery of this Phase in the context of the whole LA BSF project.	Refer to: Appendix 3a – BSF Programme Appendix 3b – Leeds East Academy Programme	Cleared
4	The approved Funding Allocation Model	Refer to: Appendix 4a – Funding Appendix 4b – High Level Cost Information Proforma Final v6 with Parklands Appendix 4c - SoS Approval of Funding	The reviewer acknowledges and thanks the LA for the information provided. Appendix 4a identifies the sources of funding as follows:

Documentation to be provided	LA / PfS PD Commentary	Peer Reviewer Comment																				
		<table border="1" data-bbox="1330 209 2027 611"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1330 209 1816 248">Source</th> <th data-bbox="1816 209 2027 248">Funding / £</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1330 248 1816 288">PfS funding</td> <td data-bbox="1816 248 2027 288">13,377,085</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1330 288 1816 328">PfS ICT funding</td> <td data-bbox="1816 288 2027 328">1,196,250</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1330 328 1816 368">SUB TOTAL (PfS Funding)</td> <td data-bbox="1816 328 2027 368">14,573,335</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1330 368 1816 408">LCC capital contribution (against scheme)</td> <td data-bbox="1816 368 2027 408">595,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1330 408 1816 448">LCC Capital Contribution previously allocated to scheme (now in programme level contingency)</td> <td data-bbox="1816 408 2027 448">1,027,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1330 448 1816 488">LCC Authority Works (1)</td> <td data-bbox="1816 448 2027 488">226,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1330 488 1816 528">Project Management Fee Account (2)</td> <td data-bbox="1816 488 2027 528">565,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1330 528 1816 568">SUB TOTAL (LCC Funding)</td> <td data-bbox="1816 528 2027 568">2,413,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1330 568 1816 608">TOTAL</td> <td data-bbox="1816 568 2027 608">16,986,535</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1330 651 2027 887">(a) There appears to be a discrepancy between the conventional funding in app 4a (£13,377,085) and app 4b (£13,074,285) respectively. Therefore can the PfS PD obtain (email) confirmation from the NPT for the available funding: (i) Conventional Funding - £13,377,085; and (ii) ICT (Capital Grant) - £1,196,250.</p> <p data-bbox="1330 922 2027 1390">LCC Response: Conventional Funding – Appendix 4b (PfS High Level Cost Information Proforma) shows the total funding for the project of £16,195,535 - which at that time excluded the LCC authority works (£226,000) and the Project Management Fee Account (£565,000). The figure of £13,074,285 in Appendix 4a is not supposed to reflect PfS funding but just the new build cost excluding externals, FF&E and ICT (£16,195,535 less £975,000, less £950,000, less £1,196,250). Therefore, Appendix 4b does not show PfS funding. The PfS conventional funding is calculated by taking the total funding for the project of £16,195,535 and deducting the LCC funding of £595,200 and £1,027,000 and PfS ICT funding of £1,196,250, which equals</p>	Source	Funding / £	PfS funding	13,377,085	PfS ICT funding	1,196,250	SUB TOTAL (PfS Funding)	14,573,335	LCC capital contribution (against scheme)	595,200	LCC Capital Contribution previously allocated to scheme (now in programme level contingency)	1,027,000	LCC Authority Works (1)	226,000	Project Management Fee Account (2)	565,000	SUB TOTAL (LCC Funding)	2,413,200	TOTAL	16,986,535
Source	Funding / £																					
PfS funding	13,377,085																					
PfS ICT funding	1,196,250																					
SUB TOTAL (PfS Funding)	14,573,335																					
LCC capital contribution (against scheme)	595,200																					
LCC Capital Contribution previously allocated to scheme (now in programme level contingency)	1,027,000																					
LCC Authority Works (1)	226,000																					
Project Management Fee Account (2)	565,000																					
SUB TOTAL (LCC Funding)	2,413,200																					
TOTAL	16,986,535																					

Documentation to be provided	LA / PfS PD Commentary	Peer Reviewer Comment
		<p>£13,377,085.</p> <p>Updated 13.06.2011: Cleared</p> <p>The reviewer notes the Report to Executive Board at Appendix 7a.</p> <p>(b) When in place please can the LA provide a copy of the minutes which support the submission of the stage 0 to PfS and endorse the LA contribution noted within the report at Appendix 7a.</p> <p>LCC Response: Executive Board Report is presented on 22 June therefore minutes will be forwarded approx 24 June 2011</p>
5	<p>Section 151 Letter underwriting all LA programme and delivery costs for this phase (See Guidance) and confirming that the remainder of the Wave remains affordable.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 5 – Section 151 Letter To forward after Executive Board Approval on 22 June 2011.</p>	<p>The LA comments are noted. Please can the LA provide a draft (unsigned) copy of the s151 letter to enable the reviewer to check against the checklist point noted herein.</p> <p>LCC Response: Currently liaising with colleagues in Central Finance and will forward as soon as agreed</p>
	<p>Section 151 Letter – Compliance Check</p> <p>1) Statement of ownership of the assumptions underpinning the affordability and value for money calculations in the OBC;</p> <p>2) A clear description, supported by a table or tables showing the costs of individual elements of the project (PFI Construction, FM, Life-Cycle, D&B Construction, ICT capital and revenue, Other);</p> <p>3) A clear description of the funding streams, supported by a table or tables that will show how these meet the identified costs;</p>	<p>Yes / No</p>

Documentation to be provided	LA / PfS PD Commentary	Peer Reviewer Comment
<p>4) Clear identification of all currently identified affordability gaps within each area of the project in the base case, and an indication as to how these will be met;</p> <p>5) Confirmation that the local authority is completely committed to delivering the transformational vision set out in the approved Strategy for Change and will make every endeavour to bridge any affordability gap;</p> <p>6) Confirmation that the sharing of any capital receipts has been agreed with PfS;</p> <p>7) Confirmation that the local authority will return any unspent BSF funding within 12 months of completion of the project; and</p> <p>8) Confirmation that Cabinet / Executive has approved the OBC and are aware of the commitments being entered into including the level of any affordability gap that may arise. The date of the relevant cabinet meeting should be referenced.</p>		
<p>6 School and / or other Stakeholder Commitment Letters relating to ICT, FM, Lifecycle and any Capital Contributions that may be required to deliver this project (See Guidance)</p>	<p>Refer to: Appendix 6a – ICT commitment letter Appendix 6b – FM and lifecycle maintenance commitment letter</p>	<p>Cleared. Peer Review Note: Please note that the commitment towards ICT will need to identify the Capital Contributions required to deliver this project at FBC</p> <p>LCC Response: Noted</p>
<p>7 Cabinet / Member Commitment for the resourcing and affordability of this proposal</p>	<p>Refer to: Appendix 7a – Executive Board Report (22 June 2011) Appendix 7b – Minutes of Executive Board Report (22 June 2011)</p>	<p>The reviewer notes the LAs comments. Please forward appendix 7b when in place.</p> <p>LCC Response: Executive Board Report is presented on 22 June therefore minutes will be forwarded approx</p>

Documentation to be provided	LA / PfS PD Commentary	Peer Reviewer Comment
	Appendix 7b to forward after Executive Board Approval on 22 June 2011.	24 June 2011
8	<p>Evidence of an Approved Planning Brief, Outline Planning Permission or Full Planning Permission.</p> <p>The following provides details of how planning, urban design and consultation have been considered during development of the scheme: Following the options appraisal process, the proposed scheme for the Academy is 100% new build on the rear of the site. Construction will be based on the concept formulated for the Roundhouse at Derby College and will provide a 6 form entry, mixed Academy, with 200 post-16 places covering 8,442m2 of floorspace.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's Planning Guidance and key planning policies (e.g. Pre-application Consultation Protocol, Pre-application Advise Charter etc.), consideration has been given to a number of options in terms of building type and site placement, consultation has taken place with relevant parties and pre-application information has been presented to the Plans Panel on 14 April 2011 and will be presented again on 16 June prior to submission of the Full Planning Application in early July. These processes have allowed time for views and concerns to be considered and fed back into the design review process where appropriate. For information relating to the Plans Panel Pre-applications, refer to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appendix 8a – Report of the Chief Planning Officer to Plans Panel East – 	<p>The reviewer notes the response by the LA including the level of work being done to mitigate risks associated with Planning consent.</p> <p>The reviewer recommends a CP in relation to Town Planning citing that the requirements of Supplementary Clarification (1) on OBC Guidance <u>Planning</u>, Surveys and Title) have not been met (to provide OPP or and LPA approved Design Brief).</p> <p>Approval is conditional in respect of E-ACT Leeds East Academy upon Full Planning Permission being achieved. Failure to gain appropriate planning permission for this school will mean that the approval in respect of E-ACT Leeds East Academy falls away.</p> <p>The Conditions Precedent should be addressed to the satisfaction of PfS at which point PfS will confirm approval. The LA and LEP should determine where the planning risk now lies in relation to the development of E-ACT Leeds East Academy through the New Project Approval Process and, if that risk lies with the LA, the LA should be aware of the quantum of risk carried.</p> <p>Every effort should be made, in line with the standard form New Project Approval Process where planning risks resides with the LEP in Stage 2, to avoid the transfer of risk back to the LA from the LEP in future submissions.</p> <p>The LA and LEP have determined where the planning risk lies as follows, which is in line with the standard form New Project Approval Process. Transfer of risk</p>

Documentation to be provided	LA / PfS PD Commentary	Peer Reviewer Comment
	<p>Pre Application Presentation (14 April 2011)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appendix 8b – Notes of Plans Panel East (14 April 2011) ▪ Appendix 8c - LCC Response to Comments / Concerns from Pre-application presentation for Proposed East Leeds Academy on 14 April 2011. ▪ Appendix 8d – Report of the Chief Planning Officer to Plans Panel East – Pre Application Presentation (16 June 2011) ▪ Appendix 8e –Notes of Plans Panel East (16 June 2011) <p style="color: red;">Appendix 8d and 8e to forward after this Plans Panel</p> <p>For current and proposed block plans, refer to Appendix 8f. Also attached in Appendix 8g are the approved floor plans (design freeze) and proposed elevations.</p> <p>A programme has been provided showing how the planning consultation process has been carried out in the context of the NPP process including liaison with the planning officer and urban design to gain support and mitigate risks. For the consultation programme, refer to Appendix 8h.</p> <p>The SPA (para 2.3.7.1) requires the City Council for all projects over £2 million to obtain outline planning permission. For this</p>	<p style="color: red;">back to the LA from the LEP will be avoided.</p> <p>LCC Response: Accepted that approval is conditional on full planning permission being achieved.</p> <p>The LA and LEP have determined where the planning risk lies as follows, which is in line with the standard form New Project Approval Process. Transfer of risk back to the LA from the LEP will be avoided.</p> <p>The SPA (para 2.3.7.1) requires the City Council for all projects over £2 million to obtain outline planning permission. For this project it has been agreed with the Leeds LEP that this is not necessary as the procurement programme would have been increased and outline planning approval had already been approved when the project was in Phase 3 of Leeds' BSF programme (although this has now lapsed and was for a refurbishment and new build scheme it approved the principle of a school on this site). Therefore, it was agreed with the Leeds LEP that only detailed planning approval should be applied for (see programme in Appendix ?).</p> <p>The SPA (para 4.3.7) requires the Leeds LEP to have obtained detailed planning permission before the City Council can approve the New Project Final Submission (NPP2). Although this places the planning risk with the Leeds LEP, paragraph 4.3A.3 of the SPA requires the City Council to give reasonable assistance to the LEP in relation to procurement by the LEP of all relevant consents. Therefore, it is the intent of the City Council to work with the LEP to ensure that the planning risk is mitigated as far as possible, as evidenced in the above paragraphs.</p> <p>Furthermore, the City Council has injected a further £565,000 from the Project Management Fee Account</p>

Documentation to be provided	LA / PfS PD Commentary	Peer Reviewer Comment
	<p>project it has been agreed with the Leeds LEP that this is not necessary as the procurement programme would have been increased and outline planning approval had already been approved when the project was in Phase 3 of Leeds' BSF programme (although this has now lapsed and was for a refurbishment and new build scheme it approved the principle of a school on this site). Therefore, it was agreed with the Leeds LEP that only detailed planning approval should be applied for (see programme in Appendix ?).</p> <p>The SPA (para 4.3.7) requires the Leeds LEP to have obtained detailed planning permission before the City Council can approve the New Project Final Submission (NPP2). Although this places the planning risk with the Leeds LEP, paragraph 4.3A.3 of the SPA requires the City Council to give reasonable assistance to the LEP in relation to procurement by the LEP of all relevant consents. Therefore, it is the intent of the City Council to work with the LEP to ensure that the planning risk is mitigated as far as possible, as evidenced in the above paragraphs.</p> <p>Furthermore, the City Council has injected a further £565,000 from the Project Management Fee Account into the scheme. The addition of the £565k would have the effect of increasing the amount available for the build, by meeting the LEP's project management fees from this source rather than the £13.693m construction budget. However, the Leeds LEP are not aware of</p>	<p>into the scheme. The addition of the £565k would have the effect of increasing the amount available for the build, by meeting the LEP's project management fees from this source rather than the £13.693m construction budget. However, the Leeds LEP are not aware of this additional funding and will only be used as a contingency fund within the control of the Local Authority to mitigate the risks arising to the project from the planning process and give us the comfort that we can meet requests for external material changes and landscaping etc without requiring any further approvals to access the wider programme level contingency. The Children's Services Project Board are satisfied with this position.</p> <p>As is usual with Leeds BSF projects the City Council will take risk of planning challenge via Judicial Review.</p>

	Documentation to be provided	LA / PfS PD Commentary	Peer Reviewer Comment
		<p>this additional funding and will only be used as a contingent fund within the control of the Local Authority to mitigate the risks arising to the project from the planning process and give us the comfort that we can meet requests for external material changes and landscaping etc without requiring any further approvals to access the wider programme level contingency.</p> <p>The Children's Services Project Board are satisfied with this position.</p> <p>As is usual with Leeds BSF projects the City Council will take risk of planning challenge via Judicial Review.</p>	
9	Responses to questions in Table 3 with additional provided where required	Refer to Table 3	
10	A letter from the DCS confirming the authorities continued commitment to their educational transformation strategy originally described in the Education Vision / Strategy for Change.	<p>As Leeds East Academy is Wave 1 of BSF, a strategy for change was not required, just a strategic business case, and Leeds East Academy was originally to remain as Parklands Girls High School within the LEA. Therefore, a letter from the Director of Children's Services is not appropriate. In lieu of this a commitment letter from E-ACT with regards complying with the Expression of Interest and Education Brief is attached. KPIs have also not been developed as Wave 1 did not require these. However, a benefits realisation plan has been developed with E-ACT and is attached. A change management plan was also not</p>	Cleared

Documentation to be provided	LA / PfS PD Commentary	Peer Reviewer Comment
	<p>required in Wave 1 and as the school is to become an Academy it is no longer necessary.</p> <p>Refer to:</p> <p>Appendix 10a – Expression of Interest</p> <p>Appendix 10b – Education Vision-Brief</p> <p>Appendix 10c – E-ACT Commitment Letter</p> <p>Appendix 10d – Benefits Realisation Plan</p>	

Table 3

Key Questions and Further Information Required	LA / PfS PD Commentary	Peer Reviewer Comments								
1	<p>LA Response</p> <p>The original Parklands refurbishment scheme had an approved funding allocation (Leeds BSF Phase 2 & 3 OBC approved Jan 2008, para 8.3) consisting of £8,194,394 of Partnerships for Schools funding and BSF ICT capital allowance of £1,276,000 for investment in IT. In addition the City Council made available £595,200 of funding and £1,027,000 held in BSF Programme contingency.</p> <p>Subsequently there was a decision to change the school into an Academy which resulted in Partnerships for Schools identifying a further £10,000,000 of capital funding and £319,000 of ICT funding to reflect the required increase in capacity.</p> <p>In November 2010, the Government requested a 40% cut on the BSF projects that had not yet reached Commercial and Financial Close. On 17 December 2010 the Secretary of State confirmed a reduction in the funding allocation for the proposed new E-ACT Leeds East Academy, which revised the scheme allocation to £16,195,535 (refer to Appendix 4b and 4c). Additions for the Authority Works budget and the Project Management Fee account bring the revised total to £16,986,535.</p> <p>The table below outlines the revised funding allocations:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="703 1315 2027 1393"> <thead> <tr> <th>Funding Source</th> <th>Original Allocation</th> <th>Revised Allocation (change to)</th> <th>Reduced Allocation (BSF)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Funding Source	Original Allocation	Revised Allocation (change to)	Reduced Allocation (BSF)					
Funding Source	Original Allocation	Revised Allocation (change to)	Reduced Allocation (BSF)							

Key Questions and Further Information Required	LA / PfS PD Commentary	Peer Reviewer Comments																																								
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="703 204 1323 268"></th> <th data-bbox="1323 204 1507 268"></th> <th data-bbox="1507 204 1776 268">Academy)</th> <th data-bbox="1776 204 2029 268">Efficiencies)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="703 268 1323 316">PfS funding</td> <td data-bbox="1323 268 1507 316">8,194,339</td> <td data-bbox="1507 268 1776 316">18,194,339</td> <td data-bbox="1776 268 2029 316">13,377,085</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="703 316 1323 363">PfS ICT funding</td> <td data-bbox="1323 316 1507 363">1,276,000</td> <td data-bbox="1507 316 1776 363">1,595,000</td> <td data-bbox="1776 316 2029 363">1,196,250</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="703 363 1323 411">SUB TOTAL (PfS Funding)</td> <td data-bbox="1323 363 1507 411">9,470,339</td> <td data-bbox="1507 363 1776 411">19,789,339</td> <td data-bbox="1776 363 2029 411">14,573,335</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="703 411 1323 459">LCC capital contribution (against scheme)</td> <td data-bbox="1323 411 1507 459">595,200</td> <td data-bbox="1507 411 1776 459">595,200</td> <td data-bbox="1776 411 2029 459">595,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="703 459 1323 539">LCC Capital Contribution previously allocated to scheme (held in BSF Programme Contingency)</td> <td data-bbox="1323 459 1507 539">1,027,000</td> <td data-bbox="1507 459 1776 539">1,027,000</td> <td data-bbox="1776 459 2029 539">1,027,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="703 539 1323 587">LCC Authority Works</td> <td data-bbox="1323 539 1507 587">226,000</td> <td data-bbox="1507 539 1776 587">226,000</td> <td data-bbox="1776 539 2029 587">226,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="703 587 1323 635">Project Management Fee account</td> <td data-bbox="1323 587 1507 635"></td> <td data-bbox="1507 587 1776 635"></td> <td data-bbox="1776 587 2029 635">565,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="703 635 1323 683">SUB TOTAL (LCC Funding)</td> <td data-bbox="1323 635 1507 683">1,848,200</td> <td data-bbox="1507 635 1776 683">1,848,200</td> <td data-bbox="1776 635 2029 683">2,413,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="703 683 1323 738">TOTAL</td> <td data-bbox="1323 683 1507 738">11,318,539</td> <td data-bbox="1507 683 1776 738">21,637,539</td> <td data-bbox="1776 683 2029 738">16,986,535</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Academy)	Efficiencies)	PfS funding	8,194,339	18,194,339	13,377,085	PfS ICT funding	1,276,000	1,595,000	1,196,250	SUB TOTAL (PfS Funding)	9,470,339	19,789,339	14,573,335	LCC capital contribution (against scheme)	595,200	595,200	595,200	LCC Capital Contribution previously allocated to scheme (held in BSF Programme Contingency)	1,027,000	1,027,000	1,027,000	LCC Authority Works	226,000	226,000	226,000	Project Management Fee account			565,000	SUB TOTAL (LCC Funding)	1,848,200	1,848,200	2,413,200	TOTAL	11,318,539	21,637,539	16,986,535	<p>The revised funding was approved on the basis of a new build scheme rather than a refurbishment. The revised scope is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Academy will be a 6 form entry, mixed Academy, with 200 post-16 places (1,100 total). • A comprehensive options appraisal has been produced which recommended the construction of a New Build Roundhouse Concept School which is based on the concept formulated for The Roundhouse at Derby College. A reference scheme has been developed jointly with the Leeds Local Education Partnership and this is affordable within the budget available and has been approved by E-ACT and Children’s Services. For details of the options appraisals, refer to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appendix 11a – Options Appraisal* ▪ Appendix 11b – Further Options Appraisal* ▪ Appendix 11c – Options Appraisal Decision report (including appendices) <p style="text-align: center;">* <i>The Appendices for these documents are very large, but are available on request.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new building consists of a steel trussed North Light frame on concrete pad foundations clad with steel panels set on a brick plinth at ground level. There will be large areas of powder coated aluminium curtain walling with some glass, particularly at low level but generally polycarbonate glazing. The roof
		Academy)	Efficiencies)																																							
PfS funding	8,194,339	18,194,339	13,377,085																																							
PfS ICT funding	1,276,000	1,595,000	1,196,250																																							
SUB TOTAL (PfS Funding)	9,470,339	19,789,339	14,573,335																																							
LCC capital contribution (against scheme)	595,200	595,200	595,200																																							
LCC Capital Contribution previously allocated to scheme (held in BSF Programme Contingency)	1,027,000	1,027,000	1,027,000																																							
LCC Authority Works	226,000	226,000	226,000																																							
Project Management Fee account			565,000																																							
SUB TOTAL (LCC Funding)	1,848,200	1,848,200	2,413,200																																							
TOTAL	11,318,539	21,637,539	16,986,535																																							

Key Questions and Further Information Required		LA / PfS PD Commentary	Peer Reviewer Comments
		<p>will be a built-up system incorporating at least 10% North Lights with perforated finished liner deck. Internally there will be approximately 31 'pod rooms' of varying sizes which in the main will be teaching spaces. The pods consist of modular steel panels over clad with either glass or coated steel elevation. In addition there will be a number of open learning spaces with associated FF&E. Large internal spaces such as the Sports Hall, Hall, drama and activity studios will be built in a more traditional manner using blockwork for robustness. The teaching and administration rooms to the North of the building will be created using lightweight metal stud partitioning with painted plasterboard or glazing in the style of the pods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> External treatment consists of soft & hard landscape to the front of the building and to the teaching areas to the rear. The existing car park and entrances are to be retained. The existing tennis courts will be resurfaced to provide hard play area. 	
		Peer Reviewer Comments	
		Cleared subject to the reviewer point being met in table 2, question 4.	
2	Has the authority set an approved and realistic budget for the delivery of the whole Wave including this phase/school (and including advisory fees) to cover the whole development and delivery period? Please provide details	LA Response	
		<p>Leeds East Academy is the last of 14 schools in Wave 1. 9 projects are now complete and 4 projects are currently in construction. To date there has been no overspend and a programme contingency still exists for the 4 projects currently in construction. The budget for the whole of Wave 1 is reviewed and revised on a monthly basis at Children's Services Project Board.</p> <p>Leeds East Academy has a realistic budget. An affordable reference scheme has been developed jointly with the Leeds Local Education Partnership and approved by E-ACT and Children's Services. Refer to Appendix 7a and 7b for Cabinet / Member Commitment for the resourcing and affordability of the project (Appendix 7b to forward after Executive Board Approval on 22 June 2011).</p> <p>Children's Services procurement costs will be met by Children's Services revenue, whilst the procurement costs of the Public Private Partnerships Unit and external advisors will be met within the LCC capital contributions. These procurement cost projections reflect the City Council's experience of delivering Phase 1-4 of the Programme and previous schools PFI projects. Efficiencies have been made by a quicker procurement timescale, due to procurement through the LEP and the proposed form of construction and the use of external advisors will be minimised due to the nature of the scheme and the limited budget available.</p>	
		Peer Reviewer Comments	
		Cleared subject to the reviewer point being met in table 2, question 4.	
3	Has a contingency been	LA Response	

Key Questions and Further Information Required		LA / PfS PD Commentary	Peer Reviewer Comments
	allocated commensurate with the risk profile. Is this reasonable and how is it funded. Does the 151 Letter commit to returning any unspent elements of the BSF funding allocation at the end of the whole Wave procurement? Please provide details	<p>A project risk register has been developed (refer to Appendix 1). There is a contingency allowance (design and construction contingency (£250,313) + survey risk price (£175,000) within the construction cost plan. The City Council have also made available a Programme Contingency (£1,027,000) which will be called upon for genuine contingency items on production of clear business case. In addition, £565k has been taken from the Project Management Fee account to pay the LEP's project management fees and this money will be used as a contingent fund within the control of the Local Authority to mitigate the risks arising to the project from the planning process and provide comfort that we can meet requests for external material changes and landscaping etc. without requiring any further approvals to access the wider programme level contingency.</p> <p>The 151 letter will commit to returning any unspent elements of the BSF funding allocation at the end of the whole Wave procurement (refer to Appendix 5). To forward after Executive Board Approval on 22 June 2011.</p>	<p>Peer Reviewer Comments</p> <p>Cleared subject to the reviewer point being met in table 2, question 5.</p>
4	Has the LA put arrangements in place for the client/delivery phases of this part of the project Are these sufficient? Please provide details	<p>LA Response</p> <p>Resources have been allocated from Children's Services and PPPU for the procurement and subsequent phases of the project.</p> <p>The LEP and the Strategics team from IPSL will be working on the design and delivery with architects from Maber and engineering and acoustic services from Arup. IPSL have worked on and successfully delivered all 13 previous schools in the BSF Wave 1 in Leeds which provides evidence that they have the experience and resources required.</p>	<p>Peer Reviewer Comments</p> <p>Cleared</p>
5	Has Section 77 Approval been gained in respect of sites for disposal in relation to this phase?	<p>LA Response</p> <p>Not Applicable</p>	<p>Peer Reviewer Comments</p> <p>Not Applicable</p>
6	Are any other statutory processes outstanding? (e.g. public enquiries, CPOs,	<p>LA Response</p> <p>None outstanding</p>	<p>Peer Reviewer Comments</p>

Key Questions and Further Information Required		LA / PfS PD Commentary	Peer Reviewer Comments
	School closures, agreement from Sport England concerning school playing fields)? Note that the Phase cannot be approved until these are complete.	Cleared	
7	Is the PFI element (if applicable) of the project affordable? Please provide affordability and U/C models for the Phase demonstrating robust cost, lifecycle and FM assumptions; appropriate allowances made for risk in the funding structure and clearly identifying all budgeted sources of income to cover the U/C.	LA Response	
		Not Applicable	
		Peer Reviewer Comments	
		Not Applicable	
8	Please provide Details of any anticipated land sales; has sharing of the sale proceeds been agreed with PfS?	LA Response	
		The leasehold will be transferred to the Academy at nil consideration. There are no sales applicable.	
		Peer Reviewer Comments	
		Cleared	
9	Confirm the LA investment directly in the PFI SPV(s) risk capital, and what quantum is involved? If there is to be no investment then clearly set out the reasons for this LA decision?	LA Response	
		Not Applicable	
		Peer Reviewer Comments	
		Not Applicable	

Key Questions and Further Information Required		LA / PfS PD Commentary	Peer Reviewer Comments
10	Is the D&B element (if applicable) of the phase affordable? Has the Council identified the capital costs of the conventionally funded schemes (including estimated abnormal costs)? Are Lifecycle Strategies clear and affordable?	LA Response	
		<p>The Design and Build element of the scheme is affordable, all necessary capital costs have been identified and the contractor's proposed scheme has been verified as within the budget envelope - refer to Appendix 4 for cost breakdown and Appendix 11c for Option Appraisal Decision report for further details.</p> <p>The design proposed will comply with the service lifespans which are identified in the City Council Requirements Output Specification. Moreover, the sponsor E-ACT has committed to spending an appropriate amount on FM to meet the lifecycle needs of the new building – refer to Appendix 6b for FM and lifecycle commitment letter from E-ACT.</p>	
		Peer Reviewer Comments	
		<p>The expectation here is that the LA has prepared cost assumptions which can be source from a variety of sound information such as previous schemes being delivered via the LEP and benchmark costs sourced from regional and national data.</p> <p>Please can the LA therefore provide the costs assumptions for E-ACT Leeds East Academy. An example of this would be proforma 3.1 or a similar level of information that demonstrates that the available funding can deliver the scheme.</p> <p>LCC Response: Please refer to Appendix 12 – Cost Plan</p> <p>Updated 13/06/2011: Cleared</p>	
11	Is there a clear, affordable and deliverable strategy for D&B FM? Has the council developed a strategy for delivering a common level of service across schools in the Wave / BSF project? Please provide details	LA Response	
		<p>The Academy sponsor E-ACT will be responsible for FM in the school rather than the council. The council will liaise with E-ACT to ensure they will be providing adequate services equivalent to LA schools refer to Appendix 6b for FM and lifecycle commitment letter from E-ACT.</p>	
		Peer Reviewer Comments	
		Cleared	
12	Is the ICT Strategy Affordable? Will the proposed solution support consistency in the quality of	LA Response	
		<p>The ICT proposed solution will be within the allocated budget. Service and support will be provided by our ICT partner (RM) who will provide the same level of service as the other LA schools.</p>	

Key Questions and Further Information Required		LA / PfS PD Commentary	Peer Reviewer Comments
	ICT provision across the LA's BSF schools? Please provide details	Peer Reviewer Comments	
		Cleared	
13	Has the change management strategy and plan been updated as a result of analysis of the effectiveness and impact of earlier waves?	LA Response	
		As Leeds East Academy is Wave 1 of BSF, a change management plan was not required and is not applicable for an Academy. A strategic business case did apply for Wave 1 and this has been periodically updated.	
		Peer Reviewer Comments	
		Cleared	
14	Are the school strategies for change in this phase/wave properly reflected in the design options proposed?	LA Response	
		As Leeds East Academy is Wave 1 of BSF, a strategy for change was not required, just a strategic business case (SBC). The original SBC showed Parklands Girls High School remaining within the LEA, however changes since this time have resulted in plans for the school to transfer to an Academy, with the sponsor E-ACT.	
		E-ACT have created a comprehensive Education Brief which describes the Academy's vision and aspirations, and how these can be achieved. This document has been considered and reflected within the proposed design which is currently being developed.	
		Peer Reviewer Comments	
		Cleared	
15	Are the educational KPIs proposed for this phase: a good match with the principal intents of the refreshed education vision and strategy? informed by evaluation of progress towards KPI outcomes in earlier waves/phases?	LA Response	
		Educational KPI's can be found within the Benefits realisation plan which aligns with Children's Services "Leeds Education Challenge" and LCC's Vision for Leeds. These have been developed from KPI's /Benefits identified in previous BSF Phases.	
		Peer Reviewer Comments	
		Cleared	