

## **REPORT OF THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES AND THE CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND PROPERTY**

### **PRIORITY SCHOOL BUILDING PROGRAMME**

#### **Purpose of the Report**

1. To seek Cabinet's approval for the submission of a bid for funding for school capital projects from the Department for Education (DfE) under the Priority School Building Programme.

#### **Information and Advice**

##### **Background**

2. On 19 July 2011, the Secretary of State for Education made an announcement about the government's plans for capital spending on schools. This covered a number of initiatives but included the launch of the Priority School Building Programme (PSBP). This programme will fund the replacement of a number of schools in the worst condition across England. Where there are also basic need issues, these may be funded through this programme. It is intended that the programme will include a mixture of primary, secondary and special schools and, although the details have still to be finalised, a total of between 100 and 300 schools nationally should be replaced over five years. This programme is in addition to the capital maintenance programme that was the subject of a report to the County Council on 19 May 2011.
3. Partnerships for Schools (PfS), which is responsible for the delivery of the DfE's capital strategy, has subsequently written to all Local Authorities, Academy Trusts, Sixth Form Colleges and Dioceses with more information about the programme, including the bidding process, the eligibility criteria for schools to be considered for inclusion in the programme and the procurement and funding model that will be used.
4. The programme is due to run for five years and individual projects will be approved by the DfE following a competitive bidding process. This report describes the eligibility criteria being used and lists the schools in Nottinghamshire that meet them. It also sets out the funding model and its implications for the County Council and individual schools. The closing date for bids is 14 October 2011. It is anticipated that procurement will begin in the second quarter of 2012 and that the first schools to open under this programme will do so in the 2014/15 academic year.

## Context

5. The competitive nature of this programme means that there is currently no indication of the number of projects that Nottinghamshire, or any other authority, can expect to have funded. The total amount of funding available nationally (£2 billion over 5 years) would however indicate that authorities should only expect a limited number of projects to be approved. For example, the total number of Nottinghamshire schools to be submitted within the bid amounts to a replacement value of around £200m – which represents 10% of the national budget. It would seem unlikely that a bid of this size for a single authority will be approved in total. An announcement about the first projects to be approved is expected in December 2011.

## Eligibility

6. This programme is open to all maintained schools and academies. Local authorities are responsible for co-ordinating and submitting bids for all maintained schools, including voluntary aided, voluntary controlled schools and foundation schools without a religious character, in their area. Dioceses may submit their own applications for individual schools for which they are responsible if they wish. Academies may be included in the local authority's bid if they wish but may apply on their own behalf. No school may be included in more than one bid. The County Council has developed a set of principles based on the guidance received to date to define which schools should be included in the potential bid. These principles have been circulated to all schools for comment and are attached as **Appendix A** of this report.
7. The main criterion that is being used to identify possible projects is that the estimated cost of dealing with all outstanding condition issues should be more than 30% of the notional cost of rebuilding the school. The data on which this calculation is made must be no more than two years old. The notional cost of rebuilding a school is based on a formula provided by PfS. This formula takes account of the type of school, the anticipated number of pupils and a standard building cost per square metre. The pupil number used in the formula is the lower of the current number on roll or the current capacity of the school.
8. Schools will only be included that show sufficient long term demand for places. If pupil demand is expected to be sustained, but at a lower level than the current capacity, a reduced capacity can be proposed for the rebuilt school. Similarly, if anticipated basic need requirements and/or pupil demand show a long term demand for more places, an increased capacity can be proposed for the rebuilt school.
9. The guidance states that schools that have received major investment in the last 15 years are unlikely to be included in the programme and these will not be part of Nottinghamshire's bid. 'Major investment' is defined as a new or replacement school or refurbishment of more than 50% of the existing buildings.
10. Bids for schools that have significant site constraints or where there may be other deliverability issues are also not likely to succeed as there is an emphasis on the programme delivering new facilities quickly and representing good value for money. Schools that have more than 30% of their accommodation "Listed", as having historic interest, will also not be eligible for value for money reasons.
11. Schools that are selected to be taken forward after the initial prioritisation by DfE in December will be required to provide a signed statement that they accept the procurement and funding conditions, as set out in the next section of this report. This statement will be

signed, as appropriate, by the Head Teacher, Governing Body, trustees, any diocese or faith body and, in the case of maintained schools, the local authority.

12. The proposed list of schools that will form the Nottinghamshire bid includes all schools that qualify on the basis that estimated costs of dealing with outstanding condition issues is over 30% of the notional school rebuild cost: this being the main criterion identified by DfE. DfE has identified other eligibility requirements but there is no specific indication in the guidance as to how these will be applied. In order to be fair and equitable to all schools that meet the main criterion, there have been no further exclusions of schools from the Nottinghamshire submission. Caution must therefore be applied to the number of schools featuring in the bid that will ultimately qualify for approval in the programme. DfE is responsible for all approvals and its decisions are expected in December 2011.
13. Academies that qualify on the basis of the main criterion have been contacted to see if they prefer to make their own individual bid. Both Serlby Park Academy and South Nottinghamshire Academy (previously Dayncourt) have opted to make an individual bid and are therefore not included within the Nottinghamshire bid. Secondary schools that have expressed an intention to become academies, but are still currently maintained schools, remain part of the Nottinghamshire bid.

## **Procurement and Funding**

14. The programme is to be paid for under a 'private finance' arrangement. Initial guidance has been received but more detailed information is awaited from PfS on many of the details of the procurement and funding process. However, a number of matters are already known.
  - The private finance arrangement will be long term (approx 27 years). During this period, building maintenance, including 'soft' facilities management services such as cleaning, pest control, waste management, caretaking, security and grounds maintenance, will be provided by a third party.
  - The contract will be procured by a central body on behalf of all schools and local authorities. Schools may be batched together for contract purposes. These batches of schools may cross local authority areas. Detailed procurement and contract management arrangements are still to be determined.
  - Schools will be required to make annual payments towards the cost of the contract to cover those services that will be delivered by the third party provider. At this stage, the contribution is estimated by PfS to be around £55 per m<sup>2</sup> per annum at 2010 prices. Schools will continue to pay for utilities and rates. Schools will be required to sign a legally binding agreement to make these payments for the lifetime of the contract.
  - The procurement will be based on standardised designs, subject to site constraints, planning requirements and a limited amount of local choice.
15. Nottinghamshire already has considerable experience of privately financed schools projects under PFI at East Leake and across Bassetlaw. Under existing PFI contracts, a single payment is made to the contractor each month. There are three elements to this payment:
  - PFI credits - these are paid to the local authority and should cover the capital cost of the scheme. The PFI credits allow the local authority to repay both the interest and the principal of the debt.

- School contribution - the schools receive services from the provider that they previously procured themselves. They already receive an allocation within their delegated budgets for services such as utilities, catering, cleaning and caretaking. The LA requires the governors to sign an agreement that they will pass back an amount that reflects the relevant elements of their budgets to the LA to meet the costs that will be part of the unitary charge.
  - Local Authority contribution - the PFI schemes set standards for buildings and services at the outset that will have to be maintained for 25 years. In order to maintain standards, lifecycle maintenance regimes have been established to allow preventative maintenance and the planned replacement of building elements to take place. There is no funding for these elements within schools' budgets and, similarly, the PFI credits do not cover these elements of the scheme. This is known as the 'affordability gap' and has previously been met by the LA.
16. Some aspects of the proposed private finance model are likely to be similar to this and will be familiar to elected members but there are a number of significant areas where this programme is likely to be different or details are still lacking.
- PfS or another central body is likely to take the role of LAs in leading the procurement including negotiating with potential contractors.
  - There is an expectation that 'standardised' designs will be used to reduce the time and cost involved in arriving at bespoke building solutions. It is not clear who will draw up these designs and how they will be agreed with schools. There is also no information yet about how standards for those services that will be delivered by a third party contractor will be set or monitored.
  - Individual projects may be 'batched' into groups for contractual purposes. It appears that this could involve projects from different authorities being put into a single contract.
  - Governors will still have to agree to make a payment from the school's budget for the lifetime of the scheme to cover so-called 'soft' services such as cleaning, caretaking, some elements of building maintenance, grounds maintenance and pest control. The position regarding catering is not yet clear. An indicative cost of these services has been provided by PfS but this has not yet been tested against actual costs incurred by schools.
  - It is not yet clear who will sign the contract with the private sector provider. It has been suggested that it could still be the local authority or even individual schools. However, this raises the broader question of who will underwrite the cost of the scheme should a school, for any reason, be unable to meet its financial obligations.
  - It is also unclear who will be responsible for meeting the cost of any affordability gap. These matters will be of importance to any potential private sector funders as they will want to have confidence in the financial robustness of any contract signatory.
  - As soon as there is greater clarity around these issues, the local authority will work with and support governing bodies to understand the relationships proposed within the private finance arrangements and how these costs might be supported.

17. There is a risk that the County Council will be required to make potentially significant capital contributions to support any successful bid. It is not yet clear who will be required to carry responsibility to cover a number of cost areas, such as ICT equipment, cost overruns, feasibility plans, demolition of existing school buildings or any land acquisition that may be required. If all or even the majority of these costs fall to the Council, these could amount to a sum in excess of £2m being required to support each successful secondary school bid, and potentially in excess of £800,000 for each successful primary school. A similar amount would apply to a successful special school bid. Work is ongoing to identify more accurately the position in relation to the potential value of, and responsibility for, all of these costs. Until that work is complete, this risk to the Council remains.

### **The Nottinghamshire bid**

18. A number of principles have been established about the County's approach to this programme following consultation with the Leader of the Council, the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Property.

- Submitting a bid for funding through this programme is consistent with the Capital Investment Principles approved by the County Council on 19 May 2011 as part of the School Capital Strategy report.
- A bid will be submitted by the deadline of 14 October 2011.
- The bid will include all schools maintained by the local authority and voluntary aided schools, but not Academies. Academies will be invited to submit their own bids if they meet the criteria and the Council will provide information and support to assist their bid.
- All schools that meet the main eligibility criterion of their outstanding condition issues costing over 30% of a notional rebuild, and have confirmed their 'in principle' support of the private finance funding model, will be included in the bid.

19. Based on PfS guidance, officers have been working on identifying a list of schools that are eligible for inclusion in the County's bid. In cases where the condition data is more than two years old, this has been updated. This has been by a combination of site visits, in the case of secondary schools, and a desktop review of existing information, in the case of primary and special schools. The short timetable for the submission of bids has meant that it has simply not been possible to resurvey all schools where the data are more than two years old.

20. The bid has to be submitted on-line using an electronic pro-forma that PfS has provided. This pro-forma requires the LA to input certain pieces of information, particularly in relation to current and anticipated pupil numbers and the value of outstanding condition work on the existing premises, and then automatically computes the required floor area and notional cost of a replacement school. The figure produced is dependent on the school type, i.e. whether the school is primary, secondary or special. There is no opportunity within the pro-forma for the addition of information other than that required by PfS.

21. The schools that meet the main eligibility criteria are listed in **Appendix B**. All schools that meet these criteria have been contacted to give them information about the programme. This includes the implications, as far as they are known, of the programme being funded through a PFI model. Subject to the approval of this report by Cabinet, further information will be provided and implications shared as more detail is made available by PfS.

## **Other Options Considered**

22. The County Council approved a School Capital Strategy for the period 2011/12 to 2013/14 at its meeting on 19 May 2011. This was focussed on refurbishment and maintenance priorities and a list of schools was identified in Appendix 6 of that report. The new Priority Schools Building Programme which is the subject of this report provides an opportunity to replace some of the schools in the County that are in the worst condition, rather than seek to refurbish and maintain them. Any projects that are funded through the new Priority School Building Programme instead of the capital maintenance programme could release resources that could then be used to address the needs of the next highest priority schools identified in May. Given the length of the Priority Schools Building Programme (5 years) it is likely that schools that are successful and are approved for replacement may need some limited essential investment from the capital maintenance programme in order to keep pupils and staff safe until rebuilding work is completed.

## **Reason/s for Recommendation/s**

23. To allow a bid to be submitted on behalf of Nottinghamshire by the deadline of Friday 14 October 2011. Submitting this bid does not at this stage expose the County Council or individual schools to any binding legal or financial contractual obligations.

## **Statutory and Policy Implications**

24. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, equal opportunities, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

## **Implications for Service Users**

25. It is recognised that the condition of school buildings can contribute to the learning experience of children and young people as well as influencing the decision of parents and families in applying for a school place. Improving the quality of school accommodation will support the drive to raise educational standards.

## **Financial Implications**

26. The use of private financing to pay for this programme will have implications for the delegated budgets of those schools that are approved for inclusion. Further work will be needed to assess the extent of this impact as more information about the procurement process and contract terms is released by PfS. There may be financial implications for the County Council but, again, the extent of any impact will only become clear as more information is made available.

## **Equalities Implications**

27. The new facilities provided through this programme will be fully compliant with the Disability Discrimination Act and all other relevant legislation.

## **Human Resources Implications**

28. The use of private funding for this programme, and the assumption that a number of services will be provided by a third party private sector provider, will have implications for some staff that currently provide them. This may involve their transfer to a private sector provider. A further report on these issues will be prepared as more information is made available. Any staff transfers will be subject to normal consultation and legal processes.

## **Implications for Sustainability and the Environment**

29. Any new facilities provided through this programme will be designed to minimise their impact on the environment. They will be replacing facilities that are in the worst condition so there will be a net benefit to the environment.

## **RECOMMENDATION/S**

That Cabinet approves:

- 1) the submission of a bid for the funding of replacement school projects under the terms of the Priority School Building Programme and based on the selection principles described in **Appendix A**;
- 2) the schools listed in **Appendix B** to this report being included in the bid;
- 3) further reports being brought to Cabinet in due course setting out the details and implications for both the County Council and individual schools of the programme being funded using private finance.

**Councillor Philip Owen**

**Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services**

**Councillor Reg Adair**

**Cabinet Member for Finance and Property**

**For any enquiries about this report please contact:**

John True  
Service Director, Planning, Support & Improvement  
Tel: 0115 9773651

Jas Hundal  
Service Director, Transport, Property & Environment  
Tel: 0115 9774257

## **Constitutional Comments (NAB 28/09/11)**

30. Cabinet has authority to approve the recommendations set out in this report.

## **Financial Comments (NDR 29/09/11)**

31. The financial implications and possible risks associated with any successful bid are summarised in paragraphs 17 and 26 of the report.

### **Background Papers**

Partnerships for Schools Letter of Invitation to bid – 26 August 2011

Schools Capital Strategy – May 2011

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

### **Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected**

All.

M19C2893



### Priority School Building Programme Principles

#### 1. Background

The Priority School Building Programme provides local authorities with a bidding opportunity for new and replacement school facilities. This is in addition to the previously announced capital allocation for capital maintenance and basic need. It is focussed particularly on those schools in the worst condition.

This programme is planned to run for a five year period with the first schools beginning procurement during the second quarter of 2012 and scheduled to be open in the academic year 2014/15.

Government has announced £2 billion to support this programme across all schools. Whilst the term 'PFI' does not appear in the PfS guidance, the description of the proposed contractual arrangements is in line with previous PFI schemes. There are a number of very significant issues relating to this that will have to be clarified by DfE and PfS to determine the full extent of potential liabilities for local authorities and individual governing bodies.

Nationally the programme will cover the equivalent of building or rebuilding 100 secondary schools. The full scale of the programme has yet to be finalised but will include a mix of schools (primary, secondary, special, 6th form and alternative provision) of around 100 to 300 schools in total over 5 years.

#### 2. The Nottinghamshire Bid

Nottinghamshire County Council will submit a mixed bid incorporating primary, secondary, special schools irrespective of school status. Academies and voluntary aided schools may wish to bid separately as individual schools or academy chains. However, a school can only be part of one bid. There are likely to be costs which fall to the local authority in respect to the preparation of this bid.

These costs are difficult to quantify at present as PfS are still to clarify the details of the procurement process.

Principles supporting this bid will be consistent with the prioritisation principles already adopted by the County Council in the May 2011 School Capital Strategy report (**Appendix A1**).

This report identifies the broad principles that are to be applied to prioritise capital spending. In particular, the bid will follow the principle that there should be equity between sectors in the allocation and use of capital resources. However, additional principles and considerations will need to be applied in accordance with the Guidance from Partnership for Schools (PfS) which relates specifically to this programme.

The narrower criteria that will be used by the DfE and PfS to allocate funds to specific projects are consistent with the already agreed principles although they do not address all of them. The County Council bid will, therefore, meet the narrow prioritisation criteria set by PfS (grouped below under the headings PfS Eligibility) but without compromising the overarching principles adopted by the County Council.

The bid will focus on a small number of schools that meet all the criteria set by PfS across all sectors. Schools will be prioritised by the extent to which they exceed the criteria, i.e. the worst

buildings will get the highest priority. This is a competitive bidding process so schools need to be realistic about how many projects are likely to be funded. The County Council must ensure that it bids for at least its 'share' of the national funding pot.

### **3. Eligibility and Principles for Inclusion in this Bid**

#### **PfS Eligibility 1**

Schools that form part of this bid will demonstrate the greatest need in terms of condition and must meet PfS eligibility criteria in terms of:

- the costs for meeting condition needs must be over 30% of the notional re-build costs
- condition data should be no more than two years old
- the presumption that re-build projects will be based on standardised designs
- the potential requirement that VA schools make a 10% contribution to re-build costs. (this is to be confirmed by PfS)
- any school that has received major investment in the last 15 years (defined as a new or replacement school, or refurbishment of more than 50% of existing buildings) is unlikely to succeed.

#### **NCC Principle 1**

The existing condition data for all school buildings will be reviewed to identify an initial long list of schools for possible inclusion in the bid.

A short list of projects which matches the base criteria can be identified from this data.

This will then be refined to ensure that all the available data meets the two year requirement. Where the condition data is of more than two years an urgent resurvey should be carried out.

Schools that have received the level of investment identified in the final eligibility bullet point will not be included in the Nottinghamshire bid.

#### **PfS Eligibility 2**

Successful projects will be 'privately financed'. All parties must understand, accept and agree to the funding requirements associated with this private financing.

The contract is to be procured by a central body and projects may be batched across authority boundaries. However, it is local authorities or individual schools that will be the contracting parties.

The contract will include the provision of building maintenance and soft services (cleaning, caretaking, grounds maintenance, etc) by a third party and utility costs.

Schools included in the programme will have to sign up to this and commit to the annual revenue payments required under the contract for these services. The estimated cost of these services is between £60 and £80 per m2 per annum. The school will also be responsible for rates and some elements of contract management.

## **NCC Principle 2**

Governing Bodies will have to commit in principle to the private financing funding model. As the process develops the full financial commitment will be clarified. Once these are known the governing body will be required to commit the required level of revenue contribution from their delegated budgets before they can be included in the programme.

All schools in the bid will, if successful, have to provide a signed statement that accepts the conditions set by PfS.

## **PfS Eligibility 3**

Any schools included in the bid must show sufficient long term pupil demand to be included in the programme. Proposals may include resizing schools in accordance with projected long term demand. This could include increasing or decreasing the number of school places for a rebuilt school if this is considered appropriate and sustainable.

## **NCC Principle 3**

Any schools within the bid shall be evaluated in terms of the long term demand for school places. Any potential for change to the number of places within a proposed re-build will be agreed with the school and with governors.

## **PfS Eligibility 4**

Schools with over 30% internal floor area which is subject to being 'listed' under planning regulations may not be included for value for money reasons.

Schools included in the bid that have outstanding land ownership, title or long term leasing issues are unlikely to meet best value for Public Private Procurement.

Schools where there are complex site factors (restricted access, difficult ground conditions, planning constraints) must be clearly noted and the risks identified in the bid.

## **NCC Principle 4**

The bid will not include schools with more than 30% internal floor area which is subject to "listed" criteria.

Any project that has issues in terms of deliverability, including schools which have outstanding land ownership, title or long term leasing issues may not be included within the bid – subject to detailed evaluation.

## **Eligibility 5**

All schools within the programme will be tested for value for money in terms of procurement at various points during the process – if these tests are failed at any point, the school will no longer be part of this procurement.

## **NCC Principle 5**

All schools within the bid will be subject to a value for money evaluation as outlined within the guidance. This will include full consideration of the opportunity cost of any land, loss of capital receipts or cost of acquisition involved as a result the project

A value for money per pupil evaluation will be applied where there are a large number of schools that meet PfS eligibility criteria.

**Capital Investment Principles Agreed by County Council May 19 2011**

**Capital Investment Principles**

The following principles are proposed for consideration (in no particular order):-

The County Council will:

- Meet the statutory responsibility to secure sufficient school places and maintain entitlement whereby all children will be able to access a school place in accordance with the School Policy and statutory duty
- Take a strategic view across the County when establishing local Priorities
- Allocate available funding on an equitable basis between the secondary, special school and primary/early years estate
- Maximise every opportunity to secure appropriate funding for investment in service infrastructure e.g. Section 106/CIL contributions and financial contributions from service providers including schools
- Promote new and creative ways to deliver services including continuous review and rationalisation of provision to ensure best value
- Work with local dioceses and other partners to maximise opportunities and investment in CYPs buildings
- Ensure that all investment strategies maximise opportunities to improve provision, following evaluation of appropriateness, access, location and size
- Consider building condition as a core criterion when establishing priorities for future investment and review the priorities as defined by the Council's Condition Survey on an annual basis
- Give consideration to a range of mechanisms for evaluating buildings in accordance with service needs and condition survey information
- Remove temporary mobile accommodation wherever and whenever possible and only consider their use to alleviate short-term and emergency situations
- Focus investment on resolving the backlog of building condition issues rather than their planned preventive maintenance
- On a case by case basis, seek to incorporate other work where economies of scale exist and where there is a sound business case



## PRIORITY SCHOOL BUILDING PROGRAMME

Primary schools whose condition survey (P1-P3) costs are 30% or more than notional rebuild costs (all Nottinghamshire)

School	%condition/ rebuild cost	Area
Brinsley Primary School, Brinsley	73.04%	Broxtowe
St Peter's CofE Junior, Ruddington	67.95%	Rushcliffe
Annie Holgate Junior School, Hucknall	67.72%	Ashfield
Ethel Wainwright Primary School, Mansfield	64.23%	Mansfield
John Davies Primary School, Huthwaite	61.18%	Ashfield
Misterton Primary School, Misterton	58.99%	Bassetlaw
Lynncroft Primary School, Eastwood	58.93%	Broxtowe
Abbey Primary School, Mansfield	57.35%	Mansfield
Rosebrook Primary and Nursery School, Mansfield	55.55%	Mansfield
Leamington Primary School, Sutton-in-Ashfield	51.94%	Ashfield
Beeston Fields Primary School, Beeston	51.81%	Broxtowe
Carsic Primary School, Sutton-in-Ashfield	50.81%	Ashfield
Hallcroft Infant School, Retford	49.68%	Bassetlaw
Daneswood Junior School, Sutton-in-Ashfield	48.52%	Ashfield
Abbey Hill Primary School, Kirkby-in-Ashfield	48.40%	Ashfield
Dean Hole CofE Primary School, Caunton, Newark	48.35%	Newark
Tuxford Primary and Nursery, Tuxford, Newark	47.70%	Bassetlaw
Dyscarr Primary School, Langold, Worksop	46.85%	Bassetlaw
Carr Hill Primary School, Retford	44.38%	Bassetlaw
Maun Infant School, New Ollerton, Newark	43.66%	Newark
Stanhope Primary and Nursery, Gedling	42.84%	Gedling
Holly Hill Primary School, Selston	41.58%	Ashfield
High Oakham Primary School, Mansfield	41.18%	Mansfield
Awsworth Primary School, Awsworth	40.33%	Broxtowe
Annie Holgate Infant School, Hucknall	40.32%	Ashfield
Rampton Primary, Rampton, Retford	39.26%	Bassetlaw
Sunnyside Primary, Beeston	39.14%	Broxtowe
Priory Junior, Gedling	37.90%	Gedling
Ollerton Primary School, New Ollerton, Newark	35.77%	Newark
John Clifford Primary School, Beeston	35.45%	Broxtowe
Round Hill Primary, Beeston	34.07%	Broxtowe
Wadsworth Fields Primary, Stapleford	33.90%	Broxtowe
Farmilo Primary School, Pleasley, Mansfield	33.74%	Mansfield
Sutton-cum-Lound CofE Primary, Retford	33.73%	Bassetlaw
Kingston Park Primary School, Carlton-in-Lindrick	32.59%	Bassetlaw
Dalestorth Primary School, Sutton-in-Ashfield	31.94%	Ashfield
Archbishop Cranmer Primary School, Aslockton	31.66%	Rushcliffe
St Swithun's CofE Primary and Nursery, Retford	30.71%	Bassetlaw
Radcliffe-on-Trent Infant and Nursery	30.32%	Rushcliffe
Intake Farm Primary School, Mansfield	30.14%	Mansfield
College House Junior School, Beeston	30.01%	Broxtowe

**Area analysis of primary schools whose condition survey (P1-P3) costs are 30% or more than notional rebuild costs**

**ASHFIELD**

<b>School</b>	<b>%condition/ rebuild cost</b>	<b>Area</b>
Annie Holgate Junior School, Hucknall	67.72%	Ashfield
John Davies Primary School, Huthwaite	61.18%	Ashfield
Leamington Primary School, Sutton-in-Ashfield	51.94%	Ashfield
Carsic Primary School, Sutton-in-Ashfield	50.81%	Ashfield
Daneswood Junior School, Sutton-in-Ashfield	48.52%	Ashfield
Abbey Hill Primary School, Kirkby-in-Ashfield	48.40%	Ashfield
Holly Hill Primary School, Selston	41.58%	Ashfield
Annie Holgate Infant School, Hucknall	40.32%	Ashfield
Dalestorth Primary School, Sutton-in-Ashfield	31.94%	Ashfield

**BASSETLAW**

<b>School</b>	<b>%condition/ rebuild cost</b>	<b>Area</b>
Misterton Primary School, Misterton	58.99%	Bassetlaw
Hallcroft Infant School, Retford	49.68%	Bassetlaw
Tuxford Primary and Nursery, Tuxford, Newark	47.70%	Bassetlaw
Dyscarr Primary School, Langold, Worksop	46.85%	Bassetlaw
Carr Hill Primary School, Retford	44.38%	Bassetlaw
Rampton Primary, Rampton, Retford	39.26%	Bassetlaw
Sutton-cum-Lound CofE Primary, Retford	33.73%	Bassetlaw
Kingston Park Primary School, Carlton-in-Lindrick	32.59%	Bassetlaw
St Swithun's CofE Primary and Nursery, Retford	30.71%	Bassetlaw

**BROXTOWE**

<b>School</b>	<b>%condition/ rebuild cost</b>	<b>Area</b>
Brinsley Primary School, Brinsley	73.04%	Broxtowe
Lynncroft Primary School, Eastwood	58.93%	Broxtowe
Beeston Fields Primary School, Beeston	51.81%	Broxtowe
Awsworth Primary School, Awsworth	40.33%	Broxtowe
Sunnyside Primary, Beeston	39.14%	Broxtowe
John Clifford Primary School, Beeston	35.45%	Broxtowe
Round Hill Primary, Beeston	34.07%	Broxtowe
Wadsworth Fields Primary, Stapleford	33.90%	Broxtowe
College House Junior School, Beeston	30.01%	Broxtowe



## GEDLING

School	%condition/ rebuild cost	Area
Stanhope Primary and Nursery, Gedling	42.84%	Gedling
Priory Junior, Gedling	37.90%	Gedling

## MANSFIELD

School	%condition/ rebuild cost	Area
Ethel Wainwright Primary School, Mansfield	64.23%	Mansfield
Abbey Primary School, Mansfield	57.35%	Mansfield
Rosebrook Primary and Nursery School, Mansfield	55.55%	Mansfield
High Oakham Primary School, Mansfield	41.18%	Mansfield
Farmilo Primary School, Pleasley, Mansfield	33.74%	Mansfield
Intake Farm Primary School, Mansfield	30.14%	Mansfield

## NEWARK

School	%condition/ rebuild cost	Area
Dean Hole CofE Primary School, Caunton, Newark	48.35%	Newark
Maun Infant School, New Ollerton, Newark	43.66%	Newark
Ollerton Primary School, New Ollerton, Newark	35.77%	Newark

## RUSHCLIFFE

School	%condition/ rebuild cost	Area
St Peter's CofE Junior, Ruddington	67.95%	Rushcliffe
Archbishop Cranmer Primary School, Aslockton	31.66%	Rushcliffe
Radcliffe-on-Trent Infant and Nursery	30.32%	Rushcliffe

**Secondary schools whose condition survey (P1-P3) costs are 30% or more than notional rebuild costs (all Nottinghamshire)**

<b>School</b>	<b>%condition/ rebuild cost</b>
Grove Comprehensive School, Newark	65.87%
Sutton Centre Community College, Sutton-in-Ashfield	54.41%
Gedling Comprehensive School, Gedling	42.57%
Meden School and Technology College, Warsop, Mansfield	40.71%
Garibaldi Comprehensive School, Forest Town, Mansfield	40.68%
Selston Arts and Community College, Selston	37.06%
Chilwell School, Chilwell	35.87%
Kirkby College, Kirkby-in-Ashfield	35.42%
Holgate Comprehensive, Hucknall	33.53%
Joseph Whitaker Comprehensive, Rainworth, Mansfield	33.08%
Dukeries College, New Ollerton, Newark	30.53%

**Academies whose condition survey (P1-P3) costs are 30% or more than notional rebuild costs (all Nottinghamshire)**

<b>School</b>	<b>%condition/ rebuild cost</b>
Dayncourt School Specialist Sports College, Radcliffe-on-Trent	84.41%
Serlby Park Secondary, Bircotes	40.14%

**One special school has condition survey (P1-P3) costs that are 30% or more than notional rebuild costs**

Fountaindale Special School, Mansfield