



Stamford Green Primary School



Minutes for the Extraordinary Full Governing Body Meeting

Held on Tuesday 9 February 2021 at 7.00pm

Attendance			
Karen Donald (KDO)	✓	Vicky Sumner (VSU)	✓
Louise Druce (LD) - Headteacher	✓	Rachael Wheeler (RW)	✓
Viv Gery (VG)	✓	Simon Williams (SW)	✓
Stuart Getty (SG)	✓	Helen Vidal (HV)	✓
Susie Hayward (SH)	✓	In attendance	
Rebecca Jennings (RJ) - CoG	✓	Louise Wheatley (LW) - Clerk to Governors	✓
Kate Kellett (KK)	✓	Jo Lee (JL) - SBL	✓
John Mackintosh (JM)	✓	Colin Shea (CS) - Architect	✓

Agenda Item								
<p>1. Apologies for Absence There were no apologies for absence.</p>								
<p>2. Declarations of interest There were no declarations of interest.</p>								
<p>3. Additional Classrooms Project The meeting was chaired by JM, Chair of Resources and CS was welcomed to the meeting. JM presented the background to the project along with decisions that needed to be made in order to proceed to the next stage and for building work to commence. JM highlighted the notes on costings papers.</p> <p>CS presented the project to governors and explained that since the initial plans, COVID-19 had resulted in some changes, which had affected the budget. CS outlined the three phases of the project, clearing the site, building the super structure and completing internal and external works. CS also outlined timescales for each phase.</p> <p>Governors asked the following questions to CS:</p> <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Q1</td> <td>JM asked if there had been any changes with regards to the drawings. CS confirmed the drawings contained more details but there were no particular changes.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q2</td> <td>SH asked how this compared to what was in the original budget. CS indicated that based on the original per square metre rate the costs were higher for a number of reasons including COVID-19, material price increases and higher labour costs. JL also indicated that the foundation costs had increased due to the close proximity to water and also the need to protect tree roots.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q3</td> <td>SH asked how the new quote compared to the original quote. CS indicated the initial estimate had been approximately £500,000 and this was now at approximately £670,000.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q4</td> <td>KDO asked if the tree roots could cause further unplanned problems. CS indicated that only the Club House was near to the tree roots, the Classrooms were further away and work near the Club House would need to be undertaken more carefully.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Q1	JM asked if there had been any changes with regards to the drawings. CS confirmed the drawings contained more details but there were no particular changes.	Q2	SH asked how this compared to what was in the original budget. CS indicated that based on the original per square metre rate the costs were higher for a number of reasons including COVID-19, material price increases and higher labour costs. JL also indicated that the foundation costs had increased due to the close proximity to water and also the need to protect tree roots.	Q3	SH asked how the new quote compared to the original quote. CS indicated the initial estimate had been approximately £500,000 and this was now at approximately £670,000.	Q4	KDO asked if the tree roots could cause further unplanned problems. CS indicated that only the Club House was near to the tree roots, the Classrooms were further away and work near the Club House would need to be undertaken more carefully.
Q1	JM asked if there had been any changes with regards to the drawings. CS confirmed the drawings contained more details but there were no particular changes.							
Q2	SH asked how this compared to what was in the original budget. CS indicated that based on the original per square metre rate the costs were higher for a number of reasons including COVID-19, material price increases and higher labour costs. JL also indicated that the foundation costs had increased due to the close proximity to water and also the need to protect tree roots.							
Q3	SH asked how the new quote compared to the original quote. CS indicated the initial estimate had been approximately £500,000 and this was now at approximately £670,000.							
Q4	KDO asked if the tree roots could cause further unplanned problems. CS indicated that only the Club House was near to the tree roots, the Classrooms were further away and work near the Club House would need to be undertaken more carefully.							

Q5	SH asked what was CS's level of confidence in the quote. CS indicated that this was difficult to answer, although site investigations had been undertaken extensively and as the project proceeds, confidence would increase further.
Q6	VG asked what costs were most at risk and asked about the tightness of the contingency. JL responded by highlighting the areas of cost savings if additional problems were encountered.
Q7	SH asked if there were any areas open to negotiation with regards to the contractors as a way of savings costs. CS indicated that he had scrutinised the costings and highlighted that lower specification bi-fold doors were an area of potential saving. This was discussed further and concern was expressed with compromising on quality with doors.
Q8	JM asked what would constitute landscaping. CS indicated that this incorporated decking, trees and fencing. JL indicated that some Other Works could potentially be delayed into another financial year if required.

Governors discussed the implications of the tree roots on the project and CS indicated that trees on the school grounds in the project area were not under a tree protection order but trees in nearby residents' gardens were. CS was thanked for his time and work on the project.

[CS left 7.36pm]

JL presented the costs and finance for the final budget plan to governors. JL highlighted each line indicating how costs had been determined and whether the work could be undertaken in a different financial year. JL summarised the total cost would be £670,145 with a total finance of £597,936. This resulted in a shortfall of £72,209. It was noted that the total cost of the project was approximately £695,000 as £24,000 had already been paid in professional fees.

Governors discussed the potential ways of making savings through phasing work over the subsequent financial years in particular in the areas of other works and IT works. JL also noted also that the contingency allowance was low but the architects advice was that too much contingency money can lead to wastage.

Governors asked the following questions to JL:

Q9	JM asked if the costs for the building were reliable. JL indicated that the industry standard of cost per square metre had been used in the feasibility study and had now been confirmed at the building stage.
Q10	JM asked what could be delayed to subsequent years. JL indicated whilst undertaking the project in two phases would resolve initial cash flow problems; it would push up the costs in the long run. JL indicated that it would be more prudent to erect the three classrooms but delay the fitting out if required. JL indicated that some of the IT, landscaping and canopies could be undertaken in a different financial year. SH estimated that this would result in approximately £85,000. JL indicated that her preference would be to find the shortfall from the delegated budget and agree the funding for the whole project. If further costs were encountered, other areas could then be scaled back. JL highlighted that even with the shortfall funded from the delegated budget; the school was still over the agreed 3% of IO1 funding for carry forward. JL also highlighted that funding had been accrued for the purpose of this project and it had not been planned to keep a large carry forward. RJ shared with governors that the reserves had been accrued following the agreement of taking the bulge class for the purpose of this project.
Q11	RJ asked where £24,128, the professional fees paid to date, came from. JL reminded that governors had agreed previously that £250,000 would come from the delegated budget and Nursery and Extended Service budgets. This had been used for fees

	and the cost of the new sheds – there was a balance of approximately £150,000 which was included in the finance plan.
Q12	VG asked if governors should consider a school building with a lower spec. Governors discussed the sedum roof and cladding, plus whether some areas of the specification should be reconsidered. HV raised the educational value of learning in a special inspiring place.

JM asked JL to provide an update on the contribution from Surrey, how the project had changed and how the shortfall should be made up.

Surrey County Council contribution

JL shared that the contribution from Surrey of £350,000, whilst received via email from several sources, had not yet been received formally in writing. Surrey had however, outlined what steps were needed in order to release the funds. JL also highlighted that regarding the super structure, there was a risk with an increase in price if it was not ordered. JL indicated that following confirmation in writing from Surrey, the school would like to proceed. This would begin with the clearing of the sheds. VG asked if there was a risk Surrey could reduce the £350,000 to £300,000. JL reassured governors that Surrey were legally obligated to provide for the bulge class and £350,000 had been set aside.

Changes up to now

JL reminded governors that they had approved the moving of £50,000 from the delegated budget and £200,000 from Nursery and Extended Services, into Capital. £150,000 of that still remained. JL also shared that the current carry forward in the delegated budget was higher than at draft budget to the sum of £22,500. It was proposed to include this forecast surplus along with an increase from Nursery at draft budget, from £50,000 to £75,000. JL also highlighted that £30,000 would not be taken from Extended Services due to the current closure due to COVID-19. With the adjustments agreed, project costs of £597,936 would result in a shortfall of £72,209. JL highlighted the different fundraising options discussed in the papers and also outlined possibilities for additional funding. JL also flagged that the money in reserves for 2023-2024 would be just above 3% of IO1 funding of the balance was taken from reserves.

How we make up the shortfall

JL proposed taking the £72,209 shortfall from the delegated budget. Governors asked the following questions:

Q13	VG asked at what point do we decide, if there is an overspend taking the school over the total budget for the project, that a decision needs to be made regarding the sedum roof, for example. SW responded that any problem with the ground works or super structure would require the governing body to revisit the plans. JL highlighted the decision to be agreed would be to go ahead with the budget as it is with the shortfall coming from delegated budget, subject to the confirmation in writing from Surrey of their contribution of £350,000.
Q14	SH asked what the implications were if the money was not moved now from the delegated budget? JL indicated the school would be signing a contract for a project that money had not been set aside for. JL highlighted it could still be added at a different point in time but the budget may require resubmission to Surrey.
Q15	KK asked when the money would be received from Surrey. JL indicated that there are various stages when the money would be received and she expected that this would make up part of the confirmation in writing.

Governors agreed to vote on funding the current project deficit from the delegated budget and also vote on approving the initial site clearance of sheds/bin store plus the ground works, and commencement of the super structure, following receipt of Surrey's contribution in writing. Governors also noted the need to move £75,000 from Nursery to Capital although this would be formally approved

when the budget is approved in April.

DECISION: Governors agreed to fund the budget shortfall of £72,209 from the delegated budget.

DECISION: Governors agreed to proceed to the next stage (placing contracts) subject to the receipt of Surrey's contribution in writing of £350,000 for the self-delivery agreement.

ACTION: JL to confirm receipt of Surrey's contribution in writing of £350,000 for the self delivery agreement to governors.

DECISION: Governors agreed to contract for the site clearance work to commence for the removal of the bin store and sheds.

KK asked if there was a timeline from SCC of when payments would be required and JL indicated that it was anticipated that this would follow.

Governors thanked JL for all her work and noted the healthy questioning and discussion.

The meeting finished at 8.36pm

Advice given by Governors at this school is incidental to their professional expertise and is not being given in their professional capacity. Governors must respect the confidence of those items of business which a Governing Body decides and not disclose what individual Governors have said or how they have voted within a meeting.

Signed: _____

Date: _____