

Beauly Primary Stakeholder Group Meeting Minutes Meeting No. 7

Microsoft Teams

6 December 2022 at 7 pm

Present	Organisation	Initials
Stakeholders		
Lynsay Boyle	Parent Council	LB
Liz Chisholm	Resident	LC
Robert Logan	Resident	RL
Jenny English	Parent Council	JE
Siobhan Grieger	Parent Council	SG
Deirdre Murray	Parent Council	DM
Seona Fraser	Beauly Community Council	SF
Ann-Marie Stewart	Representing Kate Forbes MSP	AMS
Judith Whitelaw	Resident	JW
Steven MacKenzie	Shinty Club	SMK
Councillors		
Helen Crawford		HC
Emma Knox		EK
Highland Council		
Robert Campbell	Service lead Capital Planning & Estate Strategy	RC
Tracey Fraser-Lee	Head Teacher (Beauly PS)	TFL
Dorothy Gibb	Principal Estates Officer	DG
Susie Lockett	Teacher (Beauly PS)	SL
Alan Paul	Estates Officer	AP
Fiona Shearer	Area Education Manager South	FS
Gordon Stewart	Education Advisor	GS
Apologies		
Chris Ballance	Local Member	
David Fraser	Local Member	
Fiona Sangster	Estates Co-ordinator	
Simon Swanson	Head of Investment & Programme Mgmt, HLH	

Agenda item	Action
1. Welcome and apologies	

Agenda item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr Emma Knox welcomed everyone to the meeting. • RC informed the group that the meeting would be recorded. • Apologies were noted from Cllr David Fraser, Cllr Chris Ballance, Fiona Sangster and Simon Swanson. • SG wished to note that the previous minutes be amended to include a note of THCs duty of care to the staff and pupils who are currently accommodated in the flat roofed building. 	
<p>2. Membership of group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JW is no longer a committee member of Gala Tots but is a resident of Croyard Road and therefore wishes to remain on the Stakeholder Group. • Sarah Finnegan had also been representing Gala Tots. FS to check if this is still the case. • DG reminded the Community Council that their responsibility as members of the Stakeholder Group is to go back to their groups and disseminate that information. • DG also offered to provide further information for any groups who were holding a meeting and who would find this useful. • EK also noted that RC and DG have also offered to come to any online meetings to provide an update for any groups who request it. • LB asked if there had been any more thought given to in-person meetings. Councillors had discussed this with the school and had been supportive of this. • RC replied that he attends a number of Stakeholder meetings for various projects and that they work well on Teams so they will continue in that format unless there is a specific reason for an in-person meeting. • RC also noted that dates were to be agreed for drop- in meetings for the planning application and they will be in person at the school. Although not specifically required for this project, it was intended to hold them hopefully late in January. 	FS
<p>3. Project update – Robert Campbell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC shared a presentation with an update on the project. • RC confirmed that the bid for LEIP funding had been submitted in October and THC have since been in discussions with the Scottish Government and the Scottish Futures Trust. • The outcome should be announced before Christmas. • One of the funding conditions of the Phase 3 projects is that the buildings will be open to pupils by the end of 2027. • Earlier completion is very much encouraged, and THC have highlighted that the four primary schools included in the bid could be built concurrently. • Broadford requires to be completed by the end of 2025 as it was part of the LEIP Phase 2, with the other three schools capable of being delivered in a similar timescale. 	

Agenda item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Capital Programme Review is under consideration and a meeting is proposed for early January. This will determine which projects will be included in the revised programme and the timing of the projects. • RC clarified that the Scottish Government LEIP funding is for revenue only and that THC has to provide the capital funding. However, the LEIP funding would strengthen the case for these projects to remain in the revised Capital programme. • This is a significant amount of funding from the Scottish Government and there has been a lot of work going on in the background relating to the bids. Cllr Finlayson has been in regular contact with Kate Forbes office regarding them and THC are hopeful of a good outcome. • THC have been continuing with design work. • The alternative building locations were presented at the last meeting and THC have also been looking at the floorplans and room layouts. • A two-storey building had been considered, largely because the LEIP funding has stringent energy targets which are more easily achieved with more compact buildings. However, if this does not meet our needs educationally then this will be reconsidered. • Discussions took place recently with TFL on floorplans and the Design Team have also been working with Aberdeen-shire Council who have recently completed post-occupancy reviews on recent builds which have provided some feedback. • RC noted that options for providing alternative temporary modular units had been looked at but in discussions with TFL it had been agreed that it was not worth pursuing due to the additional upheaval. Therefore, the plan remains to install two temporary double modular units adjacent to the flat roofed building to provide the equivalent of 4 classrooms. • The planning application has now been submitted for the temporary units and clearly states the units are an interim solution to allow us to decant the flat-roofed building. The maximum timescale for these buildings is 5 years so they are viewed as a temporary measure. • The Building Warrant was submitted earlier today. • Initial Bat surveys have been carried out and identified potential bat presence so further surveys are required to identify if there are roosts and whether further mitigation is required prior to installing the units. • The bat hibernation period is from now until March/April so it is hoped this will not impact installation of the units. • The programme is based on the need for planning approval with ground works proposed for four weeks in February with installation to follow. 	

Agenda item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The units currently being used for Ness Castle Primary School will be available for March and will be relocated to Beaulieu. • In the meantime, dehumidifiers have been set up in the flat roof building and some roof repairs are being carried out. • The floorplans and position of the new school are to be finalised by the end of December and then DG will begin engagement with user groups. • The outcome of the LEIP funding application will be shared with Stakeholders as soon as possible. • Dates for the public events will be confirmed when we have more clarity on the funding position. • JW noted that she had previously understood that the school would be open by August 2024 and suggested that this date continued to be moved back until now potentially 2027 and asked what the date depended on? • RC confirmed that it depends on funding. Beaulieu is currently included in the capital programme and due for completion during the 2024/25 financial year. THC are reviewing the Capital Programme and we are hopeful for Beaulieu to remain, but the timing will depend on the outcome of the review. • RC added that success with the LEIP bid would strengthen the case and if this funding was received, a condition of the funding would be that the project would require to be completed by 2027. However, there is a strong case to deliver Beaulieu and the three other primary schools concurrently with the same contractor, so the end of 2025 is still possible but is subject to the review of the Capital Programme. • JW recalled discussions for a new school for Beaulieu in 2017 but the suggestion is now potentially 2027 which is ten years later. • RC agreed that Beaulieu had previously been on the Capital Programme but had fallen out in 2018. It is now back in, but the review is ongoing. Officers are doing all they can to keep it there. • EK has been informed of a capital review special meeting early February and hopes for more clarity by that stage on funding. • HC expressed concern about the delay providing the temporary units and asked what had caused this. • RC noted that the original site for the units had been identified as unsuitable, so another location required to be found, and this along with clarification as to whether planning permission was required or not had caused a delay. However, we now have a firm timescale for their installation and are working to achieve it. • Other quicker, more temporary options were considered but had been ruled out. 	

Agenda item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TFL agreed that another option had been identified but in order to avoid more disruption for the pupils it was agreed to wait for the original temporary units to be installed at Easter. • SL added that moving is stressful and disruptive and it was also her preference to remain in the flat roofed building for now. SL also noted that ICT was not dependable in the current buildings and that there were concerns that this would be worse in temporary units. • SG commented on the completion dates appearing to change at every meeting which although providing transparency was giving different messages. • RC noted that the date of 2025 given at the last meeting is still achievable but is dependent on the outcome of the capital review and the funding. • He explained that receiving the LEIP funding which guarantees the revenue funding gives the date of 2027 as the latest the Council can deliver it but by continuing to work on the design whilst we await the outcome of the LEIP and the Capital Review this could still allow completion by the 2025 target date. • RC added that we should know by the meeting EK mentioned planned for February if Beaulieu remains in the Capital Programme after the review , and the likely timescale and what the expenditure profile will be. Meanwhile THC continues to work on completion being achieved by 2025 subject to affordability. • SG asked if parents could be advised that the dates remain as they were? • RC confirmed that yes, 2025 was still the proposed date and agreed to provide a statement for SG to share with parents. • EK confirmed all four local councillors will be completely supportive of Beaulieu remaining a top priority. • LB asked if the meeting in February would be open to the public and press. • EK confirmed that it would be fully open and webcast. Members of the public cannot ask questions at the meeting but if they contacted Councillors beforehand, they may be able to ask for them if they had the opportunity. • RC shared the site layouts and floors plans with the group and noted that a final layout and location were to be agreed soon. • SL asked if all classrooms would have direct access outdoors and RC confirmed that they would. • EK asked if the plans had been amended after feedback on this? • RC confirmed that yes, the previous layout was more efficient energy wise, but it was considered that educational functionality is more important. • SMK asked if the ball retention net between the school and the shinty pitch was still being considered. 	RC

Agenda item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DG confirmed that it was and was also being considered for the temporary units although it may not be necessary in that particular location. • SMK noted that the Shinty Club had been in contact with DG regarding an issue with rabbits on the site. Despite a number of attempts to stop rabbit burrowing on the pitch, they had been unsuccessful. The new play area planned for school will also have a problem with rabbits. • DG to engage with the Shinty Club to work together on resolving this issue. • TFL agreed that a single storey building would be better but noted that it had previously been suggested that a single storey building would cost almost double for the foundations and asked if that had been factored into the costs. • RC agreed that it would cost more for single storey but that it was important to get the right building for the school. • TFL asked if there was a back-up plan if the LEIP funding bid was unsuccessful. • RC noted that the most likely projects to achieve the funding had been put forward and that THC considered Beauly to be one of them. Whilst the LEIP funding will strengthen the case for Capital Funding it is not essential. • EK confirmed that the additional cost will not affect deliberations in terms of Capital Plan, and that we needed to ensure we provided the best building for the school. • SL asked what would happen if there was no funding and the temporary units only had planning permission for 5 years. • RC noted that either way we would have a masterplan and a strong case for a new school and would keep pushing until we achieved an outcome. • EK agreed that the members position is that there is no other alternative. • TFL added that the school heating was now coming solely from the oil boiler which is working but has been difficult to get parts for due to its age and that this should be noted when considering the future of the building. 	DG
<p>4. Education/School Matters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TFL had nothing more to add other than that she was hopeful that the temporary modular units would arrive at Easter, and we will have positive news about the funding in February. • DG asked for more information on comments about poor internet and agreed to follow this up with ICT. 	DG
<p>5. AOCB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	
<p>6. Date of next meeting</p>	

Agenda item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be confirmed when we have more information on funding. • HC asked for an as soon as possible on the outcome of the LEIP funding bid. • SG requested that any updates were issued before the last date of term. • EK to circulate information on the February meeting as soon as possible. 	<p data-bbox="1233 271 1283 304">RC</p> <p data-bbox="1233 454 1283 488">EK</p>