

Beauly Primary Stakeholder Group Meeting Minutes Meeting No. 5

Microsoft Teams

6 October 2022 at 5.30 pm

Present:	
Stakeholders	
Liz Chisholm	Resident
Sarah Finnigan	Gala Tots
Seona Fraser	Community Council
Siobhan Grieger	Parent Council
Robert Logan	Resident
Councillors	
Chris Ballance	
Helen Crawford	
Emma Knox	
Highland Council	
Robert Campbell	Estate Strategy Manager
Tracey Fraser-Lee	Head Teacher (Beauly PS)
Dorothy Gibb	Principal Estates Officer
Susie Lockett	Teacher (Beauly PS)
Alan Paul	Estates Officer
Fiona Shearer	Area Education Manager South
Gordon Stewart	Education Adviser
Apologies	
Lynsay Boyle	Parent Council
Jenny English	Parent Council
David Fraser	Local Member
Fiona Sangster	Estates Co-ordinator

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr Emma Knox welcomed everyone to the meeting. 	
2. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND MEMBERSHIP OF GROUP	
3. PROJECT UPDATE – ROBERT CAMPBELL	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC shared a presentation. 	

- Council meeting last month approved a report updating on major school capital projects and the cost pressures facing the capital programme.
- Members agreed to include Beauly, Dunvegan and Park Primary Schools in Phase 3 bid to the Scottish Government's Learning Estate Improvement Programme (LEIP). THC have had previous success with LEIP funding - 3-18 campus for Tain, new Broadford primary, and new Nairn secondary school.
- LEIP funding is based on the Council fully funding the capital cost with government providing revenue funding for 25 years when the schools are up and running.
- The LEIP energy targets for Broadford primary are being applied to Beauly, Dunvegan and Park, so already meet LEIP programme requirements in advance of the bid.
- LEIP bids will be submitted at the end of October, and we hope to have a response before the end of December.
- Although this for revenue funding and THC still has to come up with the Capital funding it definitely strengthens the cases for the schools in the review of the capital programme.
- The outline programme has the planning application submitted in April or earlier, if possible, for the August 2023 or October 2023 Planning Committee meetings.
- During the Pre-application Notice period we will hold public events - one at the school and one online for those who cannot make it in person.
- All going well construction work on the new build would start in October/November 2023 with completion by March 2025.
- Phase 3 LEIP funding projects must be complete by December 2027 but because we are bundling it with LEIP funded Broadford with December 2025 completion, we may be able to improve on completion dates by taking all four primary school projects forward.
- Looking for completion by March 2025 with demolition and remaining external work following on from that.
- We are awaiting an update and timescale from the supplier for the modular units, so currently unable to share a firm programme for the installation works. However, we are preparing the planning application and will submit once location is agreed, and we have supplier's installation dates.
- An interim update will be issued if we have any further information on the dates during the October break.
- Next steps are to confirm the dates for the PAN public events, take on board comments and feedback, and develop a proposal prior to submitting the full Planning Application for the new school.
- All of this work will continue while the review of the Council's Capital Programme is underway.
- EK noted that she was under the impression that the modular units are being used in Inverness and asked for further explanation of the delay.

- RC noted that as discussed at the previous meeting, the possibility of units currently being used for the temporary Ness Castle Primary School in Inverness being moved to Beaulieu had been considered but THC did not want any further delays on that project to impact on the Beaulieu project so had been in discussions with the supplier to provide additional units for Beaulieu.
- EK asked if the Planning Application for the modular units could be submitted when the location is decided or will the supplier issue still need to be resolved.
- RC stated that if we can get a resolution with the supplier that means we are almost ready to go when we get Planning Permission. If there is a problem with that then we will look at alternatives.
- SG asked if we were now adding a year on to the completion date as she had noted a previous guarantee of completion by 2024.
- RC explained that when funding was originally approved a target date of 2024 was mentioned for completion. However, during the development of the design and programme it was realised that the build period is longer than initially anticipated and people have been kept informed of this.
- One reason for this is the decision to go for a Passivhaus design in order to reach energy targets. Passivhaus requires a more stringent design process and more time on site due to required regular compliance checking on a range of issues such as airtightness.
- RC agreed to look into the dates provided previously and provide a more detailed response if necessary.
- CB received an email from Charles Stephen, Ward Manager on Monday stating that the modular units were on site at Holm and would be moved to Beaulieu when a location was identified. He asked if this was still the case and expressed concerns of any delay due to the current condition of the flat roofed building.
- RC noted that it was discussed at the last Stakeholder meeting that we would not be using the units currently at Holm Primary and that we would be sourcing additional units.
- DMG explained that she had spoken to Charles Stephen and explained that if we had units available such as those currently at Holm, we would bring them to Beaulieu but that our plan at present is for new units. However, if the units at Holm are ready for relocation before new units are ready, then we will use them. We are trying to cover all scenarios.
- RC noted that either way the units would be of a similar size so a planning application can be submitted regardless of which units we use.
- CB asked if the Planning Application for the modular units was ready to be submitted.
- RC explained that the application will be finalised when a decision has been made on the location of the units and we have date for installation.

- SG mentioned a few further issues in the flat roofed building that the group might not be aware of including curtain rails falling off walls and a new leak in the corridor roof and asked what the alternative is if the new units do not arrive.
- RC noted that we would have to keep doing what we can to keep the building operational whilst continuing to move forward with the plan for the modular units. He would keep Stakeholders informed of any update on the units and will work with TFL on making sure the flat roofed building remained safe.
- CB asked if RC was aware that the maintenance officer had stated that there was nothing that could be done for the building. RC was aware of this and noted THC would have to do what was necessary to ensure the building was safe.
- SG asked for the timeframe for the modular units to be on site once they were procured.
- EK asked if it was achievable before the Christmas break.
- RC noted that this it was probably not achievable but assured the group that all options would be considered and discussed with colleagues in Planning.
- EK asked if it was possible to do the works during term time.
- RC explained that there were different elements such as the groundworks to be done in preparation, bringing the units in, and then the internal works to make them ready for pupils. Some of these tasks can be noisy and disruptive but they could potentially be managed to allow for term time working.
- DMG shared a drawing of the alternative locations that had been considered for the units and explained the reasons for ruling those locations out. Ground conditions, close proximity to the construction site and accessibility for drainage.
- DMG also reminded the group of the plans to remove the biomass unit as discussed at the previous meeting.
- The modular units will have four classrooms, toilet provision and facilities for the cleaners.
- DMG also shared the option of decanting pupils to Phipps Hall if necessary to allow for the modular units to be landed and to allow for moving in without waiting on a holiday period. TFL noted that it will be difficult to manage the move into the new units.
- DMG assured TFL that Estates will assist with the move. There will not be an expectation on school staff to do this.
- RC noted that more consideration and planning would be required before making a final decision on how and when this would happen.
- DMG also noted that consideration was being given to moving the new school building closer to Croyard Park and changing the main school entrance location. This could potentially improve the access but would also allow more space for the school during the construction period.
- EK asked what difference the new proposal would make to planning and timing.

RC

- DMG noted that this would not affect the programme. The contractor's design team have had preliminary conversations with Planning and Transport Planning who did not see any major issues.
- DMG explained the locations of the gym hall, classrooms and nursery.
- EK asked if the new location would provide more future proofing.
- DMG confirmed that future proofing was already being considered in terms of installing additional toilets and to allow for additional space for classrooms if necessary.
- RC agreed that future proofing inside the building was already covered but added that externally the new location might provide more opportunities to allow for this in terms of what we are required to provide per pupil in the playground.
- Future expansion in previous buildings has been by means of adding a bay such as the recently installed extension at the Gaelic school in Fort William. The proposed expansion area for a two-storey building, such as proposed for Beaully, is more challenging, particularly for Passivhaus design.
- SG asked if the businesses operating at Croyard Park would be an issue if the school entrance was moved to there.
- DMG explained that Transport Planning had not noted as a potential issue and added that one of the requirements of the Planning permission for new schools is the production of a Safer Routes to School Travel plan and any issues would be addressed through that process.
- HC asked for confirmation that the new building would be two storeys. RC confirmed that it would be two-storey and explained the reasons.
- HC added that local residents should be kept informed if a two-storey building is to be built.
- RC noted that the public events required as part of the Planning process would give local residents an opportunity to see the plans and engage with THC on them. The public meetings would be well publicised.
- EK suggested that the plans could be highlighted through the Community Council.
- CB asked if the proposed changes would have an impact on the LEIP application.
- RC confirmed that the LEIP application would not be affected by the proposed changes.
- DMG shared the floor plans for the proposed school building and talked through each space.
- RC added that a small meeting/interview room was also being considered for the ground floor to allow for anyone dropping in for a quick chat with a member of staff for example, rather than them having to walk through the building. THC are looking at school security and community access as a whole at present.
- One principle under consideration is allocating areas within the school into three categories: Private – school use only, Public –

<p>where public could access and Invited – where people could be invited into the space but be supervised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TFL noted that it all looks fabulous but commented that she is afraid to get too excited until planning permission is obtained and funding is secured. • DMG noted that TFL would be involved in user group meetings with Head Teachers soon where feedback would be sought on the plans. • CB asked if there was adequate outside secure space for the nursery. • RC confirmed that there would be a secure boundary for the school and then within that a dedicated secure area for the nursery, for ASN space and any other purposes that the school required. • CB noted that ELC settings required to have doors that the children could operate themselves if they wanted to go outside to play. • RC confirmed that this was provided in all new nursery settings. The general principle is for free flow for the pupils between indoors and outdoors and within a secure area of the school campus. • SG asked if the proposed design lends itself to community use. • RC confirmed yes through the school let booking system managed by FM staff. • EK asked if THC required any assistance from the Stakeholder group. • RC stated that if there were no objections from the group THC would continue to take the plans forward in close liaison with TFL. • The priority is to get the planning application for the demountable units submitted and an interim update will be shared when possible. • DMG noted that there will be some digging and boring happening through the October holidays and wanted to reassure TFL that the ground would be re-instated after this. • LC asked DMG about the neighbouring properties being surveyed before any major works were carried out. • DMG to check if a dilapidation survey would be required. 	<p>DMG</p>
<p>4. EDUCATION/SCHOOL MATTERS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None. 	
<p>6. AOCB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None. 	

7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING	
--------------------------------	--

- 17 November previously agreed but to be confirmed.
- SG noted that other parents had indicated a later time for meetings would be preferred – 7 pm if possible.