

# City of Edinburgh Council

10am, Thursday, 20 August 2015

## Future Investment in the School Estate – Wave 4

Item number	8.3
Report number	
Executive/routine	Executive
Wards	All

### Executive summary

---

At its meeting on [25 September 2014](#) Council noted the position regarding the two existing unfunded priorities in, and approved the approach to determining the remaining scope of, the Wave 4 school investment programme.

The purpose of this report is to advise the outcome of the first stage of the process to determine the remaining scope of the Wave 4 programme and seek approval for four secondary schools to be shortlisted for further consideration.

### Links

---

Coalition pledges	<a href="#">P03</a>
Council outcomes	<a href="#">C01</a> and <a href="#">C02</a>
Single Outcome Agreement	<a href="#">S03</a>

## Future Investment in the School Estate – Wave 4

### Recommendations

---

- 1.1 Approve that the four secondary schools identified in this report be shortlisted for further consideration and note that a report will be taken back to Council on the outcome of this process, together with the proposed approach to prioritisation, at a later date.

### Background

---

- 2.1 Since 2000 the Council has undertaken a significant and sustained level of investment in its school estate. Two large Public Private Partnership (PPP) programmes have been delivered in addition to a number of individual projects. With funding identified to deliver all five schools in the Wave 3 programme and most of the projects already well underway, it is now appropriate to consider a fourth wave of investment – a 'Wave 4' school investment programme.
- 2.2 When considering the projects to be included in a Wave 4 programme and their relative priority, cognisance must be taken of two of the existing unfunded priorities which must, by their nature, be included as the first and second priority. The first priority is the requirement to respond to the challenges of rising primary school rolls to ensure that the Council's statutory duties are fulfilled; the second priority being the existing commitment made by the Council to delivering a new secondary school in Craigmillar.
- 2.3 At its meeting on [25 September 2014](#) Council noted the position regarding the two existing unfunded priorities in, and approved the approach to determining the remaining scope of, the Wave 4 school investment programme.
- 2.4 The purpose of this report is to advise the outcome of the first stage of the process to determine the remaining scope of the Wave 4 programme and seek approval for four secondary schools to be shortlisted for further consideration.

### Main report

---

- 3.1 It was agreed that the Wave 4 programme would follow the lead of earlier initiatives and focus mainly on secondary schools, along with assessing the investment requirement for any other schools that are rated as being in poor condition; the Council has no schools in bad condition.

- 3.2 The rationale for the main focus on secondary schools was that the replacement, or partial renewal or upgrade, of a secondary school would benefit a significant number of pupils. The type of specialist facilities provided in a secondary school are also more complex than the standard classrooms provided in a primary school and are therefore more likely to require upgrade to ensure they reflect the modern curriculum.
- 3.3 A bid for a replacement Queensferry High School has been submitted to the Scottish Government, as approved by Council on [25 September 2014](#). Should, for whatever reason, Scottish Government funding not become available then Queensferry High School would also be included within the Wave 4 process but below the existing commitments outlined in paragraph 2.2 of this report.
- 3.4 Therefore excluding Queensferry High School there are six secondary schools which have not had any significant investment in the last fifteen years and where replacement is not already committed. These are Balerno, Currie, Leith, Liberton, Trinity and WHEC and Council agreed that these schools should be considered.
- 3.5 It was also agreed that the other focus of the Wave 4 programme would be to assess all remaining poor condition (C) schools to ensure they are all suitably addressed by planned upgrade. Condition is rated on a scale of A-D with A being best. The remaining schools in the estate that were assessed in the 2012/13 condition surveys as being in poor condition are all primary schools and were as follows: Abbeyhill, Blackhall, Gilmerton, Holy Cross, Nether Currie, St Cuthbert's, St John Vianney and Stenhouse. Council agreed that these eight primary schools should also be considered.
- 3.6 On [25 September 2014](#) Council approved a two stage approach to determining the remaining scope of the Wave 4 programme. The first stage of the process involves an initial assessment to determine a shortlist of schools for further consideration regarding the most appropriate and suitable solution i.e. refurbishment or complete replacement. The criteria to determine what secondary and primary schools would proceed to the shortlist are as follows:

#### *Primary Schools*

- If the existing building structure is identified as having a short life expectancy the school would proceed to the shortlist.
- If, even following the existing approved investment, the school would be expected to remain as in poor condition then the school would proceed to the shortlist.

#### *Secondary Schools*

- If the existing building structure is identified as having a short life expectancy the school would proceed to the shortlist.
- If the core facilities could not support the necessary size of the expected future school roll then the school would proceed to the shortlist.

- For any remaining schools not already shortlisted as a result of either of the above criteria, those with the lowest combined condition and suitability scores which are considered to merit further detailed examination would proceed to the shortlist.
- 3.7 This first stage of the process has now been completed. The details of the outcomes are provided in Appendix 1 with the following conclusions arising:
- (i) There are no life expectancy or condition issues which would mean that any of the eight primary schools should be shortlisted.
  - (ii) There are no issues with the life expectancy of the six secondary schools which would mean that they should be short-listed for that reason.
  - (iii) Trinity Academy has been identified as already having issues with its core facilities to meet its existing capacity and forecast roll increases will exacerbate this.
  - (iv) Four of the secondary schools (Trinity, Liberton, Balerno and WHEC) have a combined condition/suitability score of below 60%, the lowest (Trinity) being 56.25%, however a margin of only 2% separates them. In comparison, the combined scores for the five schools in the Wave 3 programme ranged from 54.75% to 44%. It is proposed that these four schools be shortlisted for further assessment.
  - (v) The remaining two secondary schools (Leith and Currie) have, in comparison with the other four schools, high combined scores and are rated as being 'satisfactory' (B) for both condition and suitability. It is proposed that these two schools are not shortlisted.
- 3.8 For those four secondary schools which it is proposed are shortlisted the second stage process will be progressed to determine whether refurbishment or new build would be the appropriate intervention. This will be achieved by undertaking feasibility studies to assess any potential suitability and sufficiency improvements that the existing building could offer, with extension where necessary, together with an examination of how the building environment and suitability could be upgraded through refurbishment, identifying costs.
- 3.9 These studies will also assess the deliverability of any suggested approaches including any planning issues and the extent of potential disruption to the school and any decant accommodation which would be required as a consequence (and the cost thereof which would, in all probability, be revenue).
- 3.10 The ability of a school to sustain a refurbishment programme while operating would also have to be considered, particularly as secondary school rolls start to rise, reducing the flexibility to decant. While some schools may have space on their sites for new build, others - specifically Trinity Academy and Balerno Community High School - are on very small sites with inherent constraints where an alternative site is unlikely to be an option. Accordingly refurbishment may be the only choice in these instances.

- 3.11 As highlighted in Appendix 1, unforeseen fabric failures occurred at Trinity Academy in February 2015 in the swimming pool area; the recommended solution to address the issue would be to replace the roofing deck in its entirety at an estimated cost of approximately £0.4m-£0.5m. In light of the significant restrictions and constraints on the school site and the potential opportunity for other approaches to this part of the building to be considered it is proposed that no remedial work be progressed at this time and that the future use of this area be considered as part of the planned feasibility study. During this period Children and Families will make every reasonable effort to ensure alternative swimming arrangements are provided where required for all those who previously used the Trinity Academy swimming pool.
- 3.12 The feasibility studies will not be progressed until the exercise to establish the future capacity requirements of the four secondary schools has been completed. Once the studies have been completed, the conclusions will be reported to Council together with the recommended approach to prioritisation.
- 3.13 In the interim, this matter will be kept under review and if a point did arise when there was the prospect of additional capital funding becoming available in the near future, the appropriate prioritisation would be undertaken based on the available information prevailing at that time. However, the likelihood of such a situation arising is considered to be remote as:
- The costs of either refurbishing or replacing any of these schools would be very significant and there appears to be very little prospect of significant levels of new additional capital funding being available in the next five years at least.
  - Even if capital funding did become available, there are already significant unfunded capital priorities equating to nearly £200m as detailed in the report to the Finance and Resources Committee on [15 January 2015](#). This includes the considerable level of backlog maintenance work required across the Council estate and the estimated costs of the two existing unfunded priorities in the Wave 4 programme. This sum excludes any capital funding which the Council may require to provide towards the future infrastructure requirements as a consequence of housing growth in the city initiated through the Local Development Plan.

## Measures of success

---

- 4.1 The eventual scoping of a Wave 4 school investment programme which fully encapsulates the priorities for future investment in the school estate.

## Financial impact

---

- 5.1 The cost of undertaking the condition surveys was £66,553 which was met from the Children and Families revenue budget.

- 5.2 The costs of undertaking the feasibility studies for the four secondary schools is estimated to be between £100,000 and £140,000; the majority of which would be internal recharge costs from Services for Communities. These costs will require to be met from the Children and Families revenue budget.

## Risk, policy, compliance and governance impact

---

- 6.1 There are no risk, policy, compliance or governance issues arising from this report.

## Equalities impact

---

- 7.1 There are no equalities issues arising from this report.

## Sustainability impact

---

- 8.1 There are no sustainability issues arising from this report.

## Consultation and engagement

---

- 9.1 Not applicable at this point.

## Background reading/external references

---

Report to Council on 25 September 2014 – [Future Investment in the School Estate - Wave 4](#)

Scottish Government Guidance for local authorities on assessing the condition of school buildings at <http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2007/03/12142801/0>.

Scottish Government Guidance for local authorities on assessing the suitability of school buildings at <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2008/09/19123626/0>.

## Gillian Tee

Executive Director of Communities and Families

Contact: Billy MacIntyre, Head of Resources

E-mail: [billy.macintyre@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:billy.macintyre@edinburgh.gov.uk) | Tel: 0131 469 3366

## Links

---

<b>Coalition pledges</b>	P03 - Rebuild Portobello High School and continue progress on all other planned school developments, while providing adequate investment in the fabric of all schools
--------------------------	---

<b>Council outcomes</b>	C01 - Our children have the best start in life, are able to make and sustain relationships and are ready to succeed. C02 - Our children and young people are successful learners, confident individuals and responsible citizens making a positive contribution to their communities.
<b>Single Outcome Agreement</b>	S03 - Edinburgh's children and young people enjoy their childhood and fulfil their potential
<b>Appendices</b>	1 Scoping of Wave 4 Programme – Outcome of Stage 1 2 Assessment of Existing Core Facilities

## APPENDIX 1

### Scoping of Wave 4 Programme – Outcome of Stage 1

#### 1 Primary Schools

##### Life Expectancy

- 1.1 Will Rudd Davidson (WRD) were appointed to undertake structural assessments of each of the eight primary schools on the basis of a 15 year lifespan. Whilst defects were identified these were deemed generally cosmetic and non-structural and not uncommon in buildings of their age or construction.
- 1.2 WRD advised 'provided the defects as noted in our reports are addressed, and provided there is a proactive and regular ongoing maintenance regime, there is no reason that the structure could not be viable for a minimum further 15 years'.
- 1.3 An action plan has been developed to address all of the defects identified within the WRD report however there remains insufficient funding available to undertake a planned preventative maintenance programme within these schools and also the other non-PPP establishments within the Children and Families estate.

##### Condition

- 1.4 The condition surveys undertaken in 2012/13 identified eight primary schools as being condition 'C' which is 'poor' showing signs of major defects. In December 2013 the Education, Children and Families Committee approved a [five year investment programme](#) of approximately £5m to improve the eight primary schools to be condition 'B' which is 'satisfactory'.
- 1.5 The improvement programme is well underway. On completion of all the approved scope of works the condition rating of each school will be re-assessed; it is anticipated the revised condition ratings and scores for each of the eight primary schools will be condition 'B'.

##### Schools to be Shortlisted

- 1.6 Based on the assessment undertaken none of the eight primary schools identified should be shortlisted for further consideration as no existing building structure has been identified as having a short life expectancy and, following the existing approved investment, all schools are expected to improve to being at least in satisfactory condition.

#### 2 Secondary Schools

##### Life Expectancy

- 2.1 Will Rudd Davidson (WRD) were appointed to undertake structural assessments of all high school schools on the basis of a 15-30 year lifespan. Whilst defects were identified these were deemed generally cosmetic and non-structural and not uncommon in buildings of their age or construction. Further specialist

investigations were recommended and carried out at WHEC (concrete testing); Balerno (corrosion steel frame structure) and Trinity (concrete testing). None of the defects found were causing immediate concern regarding the structural adequacy of the buildings but if left untreated could potentially compromise the future lifespan of the buildings as well as being an aesthetic issue.

- 2.2 WRD advised that 'Going forward and commenting on the potential for a 15 year lifespan, we would note that provided the defects as noted in our reports are addressed, and provided there is a proactive and regular ongoing maintenance regime, there is no reason that the structure could not be viable for a minimum further 15 years'.
- 2.3 An action plan has been developed to address all of the defects identified within the WRD report however there remains insufficient funding available to undertake a planned preventative maintenance programme within these schools and also the other non-PPP establishments within the Children and Families estate.
- 2.4 Based on the assessment undertaken none of the six secondary schools identified should be shortlisted for further consideration from a life expectancy perspective.

#### Condition

- 2.5 The condition surveys undertaken in 2012/13 identified two secondary schools - WHEC and Queensferry - as being condition 'C'. In December 2013 the Education, Children and Families Committee approved a [five year investment programme](#) of approximately £4.5m to improve the condition of both 'C' condition high schools to a (satisfactory) 'B' condition. Subsequently the budget has increased to £7.225m to cover an increased scope at the WHEC as a result of asbestos removal and decant costs, whilst the scope has been reduced at Queensferry due to the proposal for a new school.
- 2.6 A further £5.6m was approved for three secondary schools in need of significant investment – Currie, Liberton and Trinity. Subsequently the budget has increased to £6.029m predominantly due to the additional structural improvements required at Trinity. Balerno and Leith were rated as condition 'B' and the majority of the improvement work identified was revenue repairs, therefore these schools did not meet the prioritisation criteria for five year budget allocations and capital funding of £0.26m was allocated. However, due to the need for window replacements at Balerno and failure of the boiler plant at Leith, the budget has increased to £1.057m.
- 2.7 The Asset Management Works (AMW) improvement programme is underway however, due to the scale and the complexity of the scope of works, they cannot be contained within holiday periods and the majority of work requires to be progressed during term time. As a result this is having a significant impact on the day to day operation of the schools, and in some instances full decant or closure of areas is required.

- 2.8 Updated 30 year condition surveys were commissioned in 2014/15 to take a longer term view of the condition of the six secondary schools identified for consideration as part of Wave 4. The previous 2012/13 condition surveys only assessed the current condition over a five year period in line with guidance from the Scottish Government called the [Condition Core Fact](#). They did not take into consideration obsolescence of plant, material or components beyond the five year period, or changes in legislation or regulation. In some instances, elemental replacements need to be factored into the cost plan more than twice over the 30 year period.
- 2.9 A common theme has emerged from the recently completed 30 year surveys which is that many of the original systems and components in these schools are still in use. Although some are still in reasonable working order, they are approaching or exceeding their life expectancy and are at risk of imminent failure. The overall condition of the schools has been exacerbated by a lack of planned preventative maintenance.
- 2.10 The outputs from the 30 year condition surveys are summarised in the following table. It is important to note that this data excludes the impact of any further investment already planned to be undertaken in any of these schools either in summer 2015 or in subsequent years, the impact of which could be significant.

Secondary School	Condition Rating	Condition Score	Capital & Revenue costs Year 1-5	Capital & Revenue costs Year 6-30	Capital & Revenue costs 30 Yr Total
Balerno	C	55.0%	£5,381,218	£7,190,177	£12,571,395
Currie	B	82.0%	£1,816,044	£7,246,778	£9,062,822
Leith	B	67.0%	£5,752,772	£9,511,790	£15,264,562
Liberton	B	62.0%	£2,981,672	£8,338,676	£11,320,348
Trinity	C	58.0%	£5,994,711	£8,125,550	£14,120,261
WHEC	B	66.0%	£6,026,297	£10,110,489	£16,136,786
<b>Total</b>			<b>£27,952,714</b>	<b>£50,523,460</b>	<b>£78,476,174</b>

- 2.11 It should be noted that several schools have more than one building and that, whilst each building will have had a separate score, an overall aggregate score is identified. All costs are at current prices and exclude: future cost inflation, contingency, asbestos removal, decant costs and any replacement of internal fitted furnishings and equipment in specialist teaching areas which are also beyond their anticipated life expectancy.
- 2.12 Whilst the costs shown in the table above for each school are significant, the costs of replacement would be even greater. For example, using our standard

metrics for the construction of a new secondary school the cost of replacing Leith Academy at its current capacity of 950, including the re-provision of the swimming pool, is estimated to be £27m which is based on current prices. This excludes any repairs and lifecycle replacement costs over a 30 year period which would also need to be added to allow a direct comparison to be made and could add a further 30% or more to the cost.

2.13 The overall condition ratings for some of the schools have changed in the intervening period since the 2012/13 surveys were undertaken as follows:

- (i) The rating for *Balerno* has reduced from 'B' to 'C'. This is predominantly due to the revised condition rating for the mechanical plant previously rated 'A' condition now being rated 'D'. The original systems are still in use and, although they are in reasonable working order, they are all at or approaching their expected life expectancy and it is recommended they are replaced in the near future. Similarly the electrical installations are also reaching the end of their life expectancy and the condition rating has dropped from a 'B' condition to 'C'. In addition, a programme of window replacement has been identified as being necessary, and has been allocated funding. The additional cost associated with the mechanical and electrical services is £1.475m (capital and revenue). Further consideration needs to be given to identifying funding for the additional scope of works from 2018-20 as the original five year AMW budget allocation (2013-18) is now fully committed.
- (ii) The rating for *Trinity* has reduced from 'B' to 'C'. The most significant difference in the previous condition rating is the electrical services previously rated condition 'A' and now rated 'C'. The original systems are still in use and, although they are in reasonable working order, they are all at or approaching their expected life expectancy and it is recommended they are replaced in the future. The additional cost associated with the electrical services in total is £2.375m (capital and revenue). Further consideration needs to be given to identifying funding for the additional scope of works from 2018-20 as the original five year AMW budget allocation (2013-18) is now fully committed. Whilst short term (3 to 5 years) external fabric improvements have been completed, further cladding improvements have been identified at a cost of £1m-£2.5m dependant on the decant requirements. Unforeseen fabric failures occurred in February 2015 in the swimming pool area; the recommended solution to address the issue would be to replace the roofing deck in its entirety at an estimated cost of approximately £0.4m-£0.5m.
- (iii) The rating for *WHEC* has increased from 'C' to 'B' which is reflective of the significant investment which has already been made in improvements to the school buildings. However some buildings within the campus remain in a poor condition until the planned improvement works can be completed.

## Suitability

- 2.14 'Suitability' relates to how well the design and layout of a school building and the way it works as a whole in combination with its grounds supports quality learning and teaching and other services provided to children and the school community; in simple terms how well does it meet their needs. It is not about the physical condition of the school building and its services which is assessed separately.
- 2.15 The way in which suitability is assessed for all schools in Scotland is by following a process and methodology which has been created by the Scottish Government called the [Suitability Core Fact](#). The suitability assessment is broken down into five factors: Functionality, Accessibility, Environmental Conditions, Safety and Security and Fixed Furniture and Fittings. For secondary schools these elements are then assessed for six different areas of a school each of which have a different weighting reflecting their relative importance.
- 2.16 For each area and factor combination a rating of either A (Good), B (Satisfactory), C (Poor) or D (Bad) is given. All of these scores are then aggregated with the weightings applied and an overall rating of A, B, C or D determined for the school.
- 2.17 The end users of a building are best placed to make an assessment of its suitability. In previous such exercises it has been with the Head Teacher of the school that the assessment of all areas and associated factors has been undertaken with the outcomes being moderated by Council staff with experience in the area to ensure that a consistent approach is applied across all schools.
- 2.18 This approach was adopted with school management to consider the latest assessment for two of the five factors – Accessibility and Safety and Security. However, views regarding the remaining three suitability factors of Functionality, Environmental Conditions and Fixed Furniture and Fittings were sought via an online questionnaire which was issued to each school, the intention being for as many students and staff as possible in each school to complete the questionnaire so that the grades for these factors were as representative of the views of users as possible. The approach taken in each school was left to the discretion of the Head Teacher and the number of responses received varied from school to school.
- 2.19 The results from all the surveys completed on behalf of each school were collated and average grades identified for the three factors. The final scores were reviewed for all schools and minor moderation undertaken by the Children and Families Asset Planning Team to ensure consistency and parity across all six schools assessed. The final scoring for each school was shared with the Head Teacher who was given the opportunity to make a reasoned case for any change they considered necessary which was by exception.
- 2.20 The overall suitability rating and score for each school is shown in the table below.

Secondary School	Suitability Rating	Suitability Score
Balerno	C	59.0%
Currie	B	69.5%
Leith	B	70.0%
Liberton	C	51.5%
Trinity	C	54.5%
WHEC	C	50.5%

### Sufficiency

- 2.21 There are several elements to consider relating to the sufficiency of accommodation in school buildings. Sufficiency by itself could be addressed though the extension of a building and is not necessarily a driver as to whether a building should be refurbished or completely rebuilt. However, one key issue is whether the existing core facilities such as sports facilities, assembly halls and dining space could accommodate an increased roll.

### *Rising School Rolls*

- 2.22 A report to the Education, Children and Families Committee on [9 December 2014](#) regarding rising school rolls included city wide projections based on the latest population data from the National Records of Scotland which estimate that, as the impact of rising rolls in the primary sector work through to secondary, the current capacity of the secondary school estate will be exceeded by 2022 with demand continuing to rise until at least 2030.
- 2.23 Further detailed analysis suggests this will create capacity issues at many secondary schools in the estate. To begin the process of considering solutions to address the issue of rising rolls within the secondary sector, officers have been working to determine possible options to create additional capacity.
- 2.24 Whilst in the primary sector it is relatively straightforward to increase the capacity of schools through the provision of additional classrooms, it is not as easy in the secondary sector due to the range of classroom types required for different subjects and their grouping into departmental areas. Therefore the work which has been carried out to date has focused on opportunities to increase capacities within secondary schools without having to provide additional accommodation.
- 2.25 The assessment has been carried out by a former secondary school Head Teacher and has involved consultation with all other secondary Head Teachers. The outcome of the analysis is that three areas merit, and require, further consideration:

- (i) Review capacity methodology to determine a more flexible system where S1 intake levels are more closely related to stay on rates in the senior school.
  - (ii) Investigate opportunities where groups of schools could increase collaboration in relation to delivery of the senior school curriculum.
  - (iii) Investigate opportunities for changing the structure of the school day.
- 2.26 For each secondary school where a specific potential rising rolls issue is identified it is proposed to establish a working group involving officers from Children and Families Asset Planning and representatives from the school management team to begin the process of determining the most suitable solution for that school. As part of this process roll projections will be prepared for each school to assist with determining the scale of any potential issue.
- 2.27 The outcome of this process will be initial proposals for each school, particularly in relation to senior school co-operation and changing the structure of the school day, and an indication of the additional capacity which could be created by the proposed measures. At any school where the proposed measures are not considered sufficient to address the potential rising rolls issue identified then options to provide additional accommodation would have to be considered.
- 2.28 It is the intention to establish the working groups and complete the necessary work on development of solutions during the remainder of 2015. Initial proposals for each secondary school potentially affected by rising rolls, including details of any further feasibility studies or stakeholder engagement required, would then be provided as part of a full report on rising rolls in the secondary sector to the Education, Children and Families Committee in December 2015. This process will encapsulate any of the secondary schools under consideration if any potential future accommodation pressures are identified.

#### *Second Local Development Plan*

- 2.29 The significant new housing development across the city arising from the second Local Development Plan (LDP) will significantly increase the number of pupils that will require to be accommodated in the primary and secondary school sectors; this is detailed in the [Education Infrastructure Appraisal](#). There are a number of secondary schools identified as potentially requiring additional capacity to be provided to accommodate these additional pupils, Liberton High School being one of them. The impact of these potential requirements will be taken into consideration in the assessment referred to above.

#### *Core Facilities*

- 2.30 Once the future capacity requirements for each school have been determined, an assessment can be made of the extent to which the existing core facilities such as sports facilities, assembly halls and dining space could accommodate and support the expected future school roll. If the core facilities of the school could not support a substantially increased roll then there may be merit in

replacing the entire core of the school however there would have to be a significant deviation from the generic standards to justify its replacement.

- 2.31 In the interim an assessment has been undertaken of the existing core facilities which is summarised in Appendix 2. This assessment has identified that the existing level of core facilities in most of the six schools could, in some cases with relatively minor adaptations, accommodate an increased capacity. The exception is Trinity Academy which was identified as being problematic as in some areas the core facilities are already insufficient to accommodate its existing capacity.

Schools to be Shortlisted

- 2.32 Based on the assessment undertaken regarding life expectancy, none of the six secondary schools identified should be shortlisted for further consideration for that reason.
- 2.33 The second factor to be considered was that, if the core facilities could not support the necessary size of the expected future school roll, then the school would proceed to the shortlist. Further work requires to be undertaken to determine what the future capacity requirements for each of the schools might be before then considering if there are any issues. However, Trinity Academy has already been identified as having insufficient core facilities in some areas to meet its existing capacity.
- 2.34 It was agreed that for any remaining schools not already shortlisted as a result of either of the above criteria, those with the lowest combined condition and suitability scores which are considered to merit further detailed examination would proceed to the shortlist.
- 2.35 The combined condition and suitability scores for each of the six secondary schools are shown in the following table with an equal weighting of 50% having been applied to each score, this being consistent with the approach used in 2008 to prioritise the [Wave 3 schools](#). The schools are shown in ascending order with the lowest combined score being first.

Secondary School	Suitability Rating	Suitability Score	Condition Rating	Condition Score	Combined Score
Trinity	C	54.5%	C	58.0%	<b>56.25%</b>
Liberton	C	51.5%	B	62.0%	<b>56.75%</b>
Balerno	C	59.0%	C	55.0%	<b>57.00%</b>
WHEC	C	50.5%	B	66.0%	<b>58.25%</b>
Leith	B	70.0%	B	67.0%	<b>68.50%</b>
Currie	B	69.5%	B	82.0%	<b>75.75%</b>

## Appendix 2

### Assessment of Existing Core Facilities

School	Current Capacity	Projected Roll	Kitchen	Dining	PE	Assembly/ Social	Assessment of Core Spaces Capacity
Balerno	850	727	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Production kitchen and ancillaries of c180m2.</li> <li>Prime cooking capacity 600.</li> </ul>	173m2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Games Hall, Gymnasium and Pool. No Dance or Fitness spaces.</li> <li>External pitches.</li> <li>Capacity up to 1,150.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drama Hall of 215m2 with limited capacity for assemblies.</li> <li>Concourse social space of 950m2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Facilities could accommodate increase in roll to 1,150.</li> <li>Dining and Assembly space limited.</li> </ul>
Currie	900	736	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feeder Production kitchen and ancillaries of c200m2.</li> <li>Prime cooking capacity 600.</li> </ul>	230m2 but not all useable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Games Hall, Gymnasium, Dance Studio and Pool. No fitness room.</li> <li>External pitches.</li> <li>Capacity up to 1,400 with possible need for fitness room.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assembly Hall 333m2 with separate stage of 118m2.</li> <li>Social space in courtyards?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Facilities could accommodate increase in roll to 1,100.</li> <li>Dining and social space limited.</li> </ul>
Leith	950	924	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feeder Production kitchen and ancillaries of c160m2.</li> <li>Prime cooking capacity 600.</li> </ul>	320m2 and extendable into concourse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Games Hall, Fitness Room and Pool. No Dance Studio or Gymnasium.</li> <li>External pitches.</li> <li>Capacity up to 1,150 with possible need for Dance/Gymnasium.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drama Theatre of c240m2 combined.</li> <li>Concourse social space of c900m2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Facilities could accommodate increase in roll to 1,150.</li> <li>PE space limited.</li> </ul>

School	Current Capacity	Projected Roll	Kitchen	Dining	PE	Assembly/Social	Assessment of Core Spaces Capacity
Liberton	850	570	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feeder Production kitchen. Area n/a.</li> <li>Current Prime cooking capacity is 400 but potential to raise to 600 with additional equipment.</li> </ul>	220m2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Games Hall, Gym/Dance and Fitness Room (on completion of current extension project).</li> <li>External pitches.</li> <li>Capacity up to 1,150.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assembly Hall c.200m2 with stage area of c.40m2</li> <li>Social space c.350m2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Facilities could accommodate increase in roll to 1,150.</li> <li>Dining, Assembly and social space may be limited</li> </ul>
Trinity	950	816	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feeder Production kitchen and ancillaries of c180m2.</li> <li>Current Prime cooking capacity is 400 but potential to raise to 600 with additional equipment.</li> </ul>	242m2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two small gym halls of 167m2. Small Pool. No fitness room. No games Hall. PE classes also use Assembly Hall. External pitches off site (but walking distance).</li> <li>Insufficient PE accommodation for modern curriculum. Games Hall and changing required in all cases.</li> <li>Additional Dance Studio and alterations required to meet 1,100+ capacity.</li> <li>Limited space on site.</li> </ul>	Assembly Hall 350m2 with separate stage area of 130m2. Minimal social space.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Facilities do not meet current capacity.</li> <li>Games Hall and social space required could increase roll to 1,100.</li> </ul>

School	Current Capacity	Projected Roll	Kitchen	Dining	PE	Assembly/Social	Assessment of Core Spaces Capacity
WHEC	750	282	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feeder Production kitchen and ancillaries of c400m2.</li> <li>Current Prime cooking capacity is 1,000 but potential to raise to 1,200 with additional equipment.</li> </ul>	514m2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Games Hall, Gymnasium, Utility/Dance studio, Fitness Room, Squash Courts, Pool.</li> <li>External pitches.</li> <li>Capacity 1,400.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assembly Hall of 144m2 with stage area of 46m2.</li> <li>Limited social space other than dining.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Facilities could accommodate increase in roll up to 1,400 however increase in assembly and social space would be required.</li> </ul>