

APPENDIX C Option Appraisal – Beeslack Replacement Community High School

Option 1 – Do Nothing / Do Minimum			
Description	Beeslack Community High School is not replaced. Capacity breach at Beeslack is accommodated in modular units on site, which would be required until data shows school roll returning to capacity of existing school. By 2029/30, projections show capacity exceeded by 377 pupils. Projections show that by 2029/30 capacity at Lasswade High School is exceeded by 141 pupils. The capacity breach at Lasswade would require review and an alternative plan to be considered, which will be challenging given site constraints there.		
Expected Costs	<p>Estimated costs of modular units for 400 pupils is £9.480m, roughly equivalent to the level of breach expected at Beeslack. However this roll is likely to continue to rise. Additional core accommodation would also be required such as games hall, dining and social areas.</p> <p>Cost of refurbishing existing Beeslack Community High School to expand core accommodation to make suitable for higher numbers. This has not been quantified.</p>		
Risks Specific to this Option	Risk	Description	Mitigation
	Financial	No funding support from SG to deliver project	No mitigation available as project must be delivered by 2026.
	Financial	Uncosted capital expenditure for alternative strategy of modular units plus refurbishment	No mitigation available.
	Financial	Rising cost of ASN placements out with Midlothian Council by failing to deliver ASN provision.	No mitigation available.
	Operational	Failure to meet statutory requirement for in catchment placements	No mitigation available as not possible to provide spaces within catchment.
	Operational	Unsuitable learning environment	No mitigation available as not possible to expand the school
	Reputational	Failure to delivery key priority project from Learning Estate Strategy and loss of funding from Scottish Government will damage Midlothian Council's reputation	No mitigation available.

Advantages & Disadvantages	<p>Advantages</p> <p>Capital investment for replacement High School does not proceed. However, alternative strategies for accommodating pupils does not represent an overall saving to Council.</p>	<p>Disadvantages</p> <p>Capital costs generated through alternative solutions to accommodate pupils and requirement to refurbish Beeslack.</p> <p>Loss of funding from Scottish Government to assist with these costs.</p> <p>Lasswade HS breaches with no plan in place to accommodate the breach. Beeslack remains unsuitable due to narrow corridor widths and unsuitable core accommodation (e.g. gym and dining halls).</p> <p>Loss of opportunity to deliver school partnership with University of Edinburgh, meaning loss of skills development, learner pathways and positive destinations.</p>
Viability	Not a viable option due to unsuitable learning environment, lack of capacity within site to accommodate larger school on permanent basis and lack of suitability of core accommodation.	

Option 2 – Reduced Project Scope and £105.537m Capped Budget			
Description	Beeslack Community High School replacement proceeds within budget cap of £105,537,000		
Expected Costs	<p>Faithful & Gould have provided cost plans to support the resources section in this report. The cost plan for Option 2 comes to £103.4m (Reduced Project Scope) (see Appendix D).</p> <p>Key exclusions from scope under this option:</p> <p>Swimming pool £6,942,000</p> <p>Sports Pavilion £1,180,000</p> <p>Community facilities £2,152,000</p> <p>School built to LEIP Band A energy efficiency standard rather than Passivhaus standard. £7,381,947</p>		
Risks Specific to this Option	Risk	Description	Mitigation
	Financial	Budget may be exceeded and project becomes unaffordable.	Measures to impose budget cap ensure project keeps to SFT metric. Do not include items that push project beyond SFT metric, such as sports pavilion.

	Reputational	Impact of not providing a new pool at Beeslack replacement may attract objections from local community.	Future of existing Beeslack pool yet to be determined if school to relocate. Pool used exclusively by clubs and not public. Penicuik retains a pool at Leisure Centre. Potential capacity to accommodate clubs in there and elsewhere in Midlothian. Hydrotherapy pool provided at Beeslack replacement. Potential to make this accessible to community (e.g. people with disabilities / baby swimming classes) to be explored and included in design if feasible re management of pool. Sports facilities at Beeslack replacement to be managed to ensure community access remains.
	Reputational	Loss of Community Facilities	Community facilities to be incorporated into school metric – i.e. work asset harder
	Sustainability	Passive to LEIP Band A as LEIP not providing funding for passivhaus standard.	15KWh/m2 v 67-83KWh/m2 (not significant differential in terms of overall energy performance). Benefits re build quality to be addressed through Quality Plan.
Advantages & Disadvantages	Advantages		Disadvantages
	Budget for project given defined cap that allows school to be delivered for £90m and brought within metric. Sports facilities will be accessible to the community and local clubs. Hydrotherapy pool for ASN pupils will have potential for community access. Pool access retained in Penicuik through existing leisure centre. School management will not be required to manage a pool.		Lack of replacement pool will require local users to find an alternative pool in area to accommodate activities. No on-site pool for pupils.
Viability	This option has been assessed to be a viable option given the benefits of proceeding with the replacement high school and the funding that is available to assist in funding this project.		

Option 3 – Full Project Scope and £122.6m Budget			
Description	Scope of project includes swimming pool, sports pavilion, community facilities and built to passivhaus standard.		
Expected Costs	Option 3 costs - £122,592,947 See attached cost plan for breakdown of costs associated with this option. (Appendix D)		
Risks Specific to this Option	Risk	Description	Mitigation
	Financial	The full scope of this project is considered to be unaffordable	Remove projects from the capital plan of equivalent value to manage overall affordability of capital plan.
	Financial	Revenue costs associated with the full project scope will be higher (staffing, M&M, energy costs)	Remove projects / implement revenue savings elsewhere to manage affordability of project.
	Financial	LEIP funding not available for items above metric such as dedicated community facilities.	No mitigation other than reduce GIFA elsewhere
Advantages & Disadvantages	Advantages		Disadvantages
	Full scope will ensure that the facilities in the existing Beeslack school are replaced in full.		Inflated construction costs and limitations of Scottish Government funding will result in this option resulting in Midlothian Council carrying an additional £7.3m of unfunded net cost which will have a significant impact on the affordability of Midlothian Council's capital plan, requiring savings of this amount from other projects to offset the impact. Option does not correlate with capital plan prioritisation methodology which is to focus investment on statutory requirements to mitigate impact of debt costs on revenue budget.
Viability	This option is not considered financially viable.		

Scoring of Options Against Objectives

Objectives	Options Scoring Against Objectives			
	1 (Do Nothing)	2 (Reduce Scope)	3 (Full Scope)	Comments
Place based, designed around end user needs and their spatial context	0	3	3	Option 1 does not respond to the needs of the local communities for pupil spaces in catchment and modular units would be required to be provided for medium term to accommodate breach, presenting spatial planning issues due to site constraints at Beeslack.
Evidence based, based on clearly defined set of objectives and performance metrics	-1	3	2	Negative impact of Option 1 on education inequalities likely to arise. Full scope project not aligned to Capital Plan Prioritisation methodology with focus on capital investment to meet statutory requirements due to affordability challenges.
Joined up, delivered with stakeholders and partners	-1	3	3	Opportunity to deliver Centre for Excellence lost under Option 1.
Strategically aligned, ensuring projects respond to the requirements of key strategy documents such as National Planning Framework 4 and the Single Midlothian Plan	0	3	3	Option 1 does not align with Learning Estate Strategy priorities. Options 2 and 3 will deliver priority project.
Environmentally sustainable	1	3	2	Replacement school to be built to LEIP Band A standard, providing opportunity for net operational carbon reduction below current levels at Beeslack. Carbon impact of operating a pool avoided in Option 2.
Socially beneficial	0	3	3	The benefits of a modern and fit for purpose learning environment will help address existing learning inequalities.
Affordable	2	2	1	Option 1 has not been costed. Option 2 provides a more affordable solution than Option 3.

Total	1	20	17					
(Press F9 on each total to add the numbers in the column)								
Ranking	3	1	2					

Scoring

Fully Delivers = 3

Mostly Delivers = 2

Delivers to a Limited Extent = 1

Does not Deliver = 0

Will have a negative impact on objective = -1

1.1 Recommendation
It is recommended that the Council supports Option 2 and proceeds with the reduced scope for the replacement of Beeslack Community High School.