

## Appendix E – Property Advice

### 1. Property advice service

Property Advice providers should offer to schools an affordable annual Service Level Agreement that assists the school with all property related issues. They should be the first port of call for any building & maintenance problems or general and contractor advice.

Surveyors should have extensive practical and surveying experience of property related issues and in delivering successful development and alteration projects services should incorporate a wide range of services, including (but not limited to) building surveying, architectural and scheme brief design, procurement, project management and advice on premises development, alterations, major and minor maintenance and repairs, equipment and servicing responsibilities. Surveyors can assist with the identification of issues arising from the Education Leeds Asset Management Plans and aid the school in drawing up their Premises Development Plan.

### 2. Response rate

The total number of schools responding to this question is shown below in Table 1 from 2004/05 to 2009/10. It also shows how this figure equates to the total survey population.

Year	Number of responses	% of Leeds Schools
2004/05	122	44.85%
2005/06	85	31.25%
2006/07	78	28.67%
2007/08	66	24.44%
2008/09	94	34.81%
2009/10	84	31.11%

Table 1 : Total number of responses by year.

### 3. Service providers

Those service providers recording five or more responses are shown below in Table 2. The table lists the total responses for 2005/06, 2006/07, 2007/08, 2008/09 and 2009/10 and further breaks down the responses into primary, secondary and other phases for 2009/10.

Service Provider	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10			
	Total	Total	Total	Total	Primary	Secondary	Other	Total
Strategic Design Alliance, provided by Leeds City Council	49	57	47	47	37	2	1	40
David Yeadon Ltd	24	21	19	30	23	2	0	25
AEDAS	-	-	-	7	7	1	0	8

Table 2 : Total number of responses by service provider.

The two main operators of a property advice service within Leeds schools are the Strategic Design Alliance (formally Architectural Design Services) provided by Leeds City Council and David Yeadon Ltd. AEDAS a provider of property advice mainly for Catholic schools continues to have a presence in the survey with 8 responses.

### 4. Performance level

The key performance level review is measurable on a scale of 1 = very good, 2 = good, 3 = highly satisfactory, 4 = satisfactory, 5 = unsatisfactory, 6 = poor and 7 = very poor. The mean performance level is shown in Table 3 below.

Service Provider	2007/08		2008/09		2009/10		
	Avg	Performance Level	Avg	Performance Level	Avg.	Performance Level	Change
Strategic Design Alliance, provided by Leeds City Council	2.94	Highly satisfactory	2.98	Highly satisfactory	2.70	Highly Satisfactory	Better
David Yeadon Ltd	2.63	Good	2.67	Highly Satisfactory	2.52	Highly Satisfactory	Better
AEDAS	-	-	2.57	Highly Satisfactory	1.88	Good	Better

Table 3 : Performance level by cleaning service providers

SDA again recorded an average performance level of highly satisfactory and recorded a score better than last year. Schools commenting mainly on the good advice and reliable service

David Yeadon Ltd also scored a slightly higher score than last year and remained a highly satisfactory service.

AEDAS recorded a score of good in this year's survey. AEDAS were the company with the greatest rate of improvement in this year's survey.

The full list of unedited comments is available in [Annex E](#)

#### 5. Service providers – value for money

Schools were asked to record whether or not the service provider was delivering value for money. The responses are listed below in Table 4. The table sub-divides the responses into primary and secondary phases.

Service Provider	Primary			Secondary			Total		
	Yes	No	No Comment	Yes	No	No Comment	Yes	No	No Comment
Strategic Design Alliance, provided by Leeds City Council	23	5	9	2	0	0	25	5	10
David Yeadon Ltd	16	2	5	1	0	1	17	2	6
AEDAS	6	1	0	0	1	0	6	2	0

Table 4: Value for money by service providers

For all service providers, most of the respondents to this question noted that they were receiving value for money.

#### 6. Service providers – improvement

Schools were asked to record how the service provider could improve their service delivery and what steps they were taking to ensure that this was taking place. Table 5 lists the response to this question.

Service Provider	Primary			Secondary			Total		
	Yes	No	No Comment	Yes	No	No Comment	Yes	No	No Comment

Strategic Design Alliance, provided by Leeds City Council	9	7	21	2	0	0	12	7	21
David Yeadon Ltd	15	1	7	1	0	1	16	1	8
AEDAS	5	2	0	0	0	1	5	2	1

Table 5 : Expected improvement by service providers

Users of SDA, David Yeadon Ltd and AEDAS recorded that they expected the service to improve. The full list of unedited comments is available in [Annex E](#)

## Annex E – Property Advice

Strategic Design Alliance, provided by Leeds City Council

### 1. Please explain why you rate the service provider this way?

#### Positive responses

- Advice has been prompt and helpful. Contractors recommended by SDA have not always been as reliable as expected. - Connaught were a dead loss - but the service provided on property advice has been valuable.
- Excellent building work done on site this year.
- Always on hand to answer any questions or point us in the right direction for help.
- SDA we know well. They have good skills which could be improved by more 'key link person' communication for an individual school.
- Specific advice from Geoff Newsome has been very good in relation to key projects within school.
- Have not been using the full provision of SLA until recently. Very impressed and relieved by level of knowledge and expertise.
- Entered agreement with SDA. 1 project undertaken well - no complaints, a good service.
- We did use Strategic Design Alliance but unhappy with completion of last project - staff were very helpful but contractor went into liquidation and too many loose ends causing major headaches all round. We now use Connaught.
- I have received some good advice recently. Prioritising works can be difficult when devolved capital no where near meets the budget for essential works in an old school which requires full refurbishment.
- Always very helpful and prompt.
- Limited use on projects etc but seemed OK.
- I did not have a very positive experience with the SDA last year when I requested some estimates for refurbished portacabins to supplement an application for funding. The gentleman from SDA insisted on including air conditioning and brick skins into the quote when I had received advice to the contrary. The quotes obtained were irrelevant for my application and so I could not submit it. However, having fire stop works carried out this summer and also requesting someone else from the SDA to obtain quotes for a portacabin for the application this year, the service has been a lot better.
- Prompt and efficient.
- Not had much need for involvement due to BSF Project but good response and advice with regards to contractors.
- Timetabled meetings scheduled with proactive work from ADS to support development of PDP.
- Efficient and Helpful.
- Only use infrequently but when have needed to service is generally good.
- Mostly good but follow up problems after contracts complete not always good.
- When called upon the service is reliable and constructive.
- An excellent service which has always supported the school and myself to a high level.
- We have had no projects this financial year that have needed input. All phone queries have been dealt with efficiently.
- Not really had any benefit from this service. Spoke to procurement a few times re various issues, no one has returned my call. Boiler enquiries are always dealt but anything else seems rather vague.

#### Negative responses

- SDA expensive and contracted work not good quality.
- Do not use often.
- Not a good year.

- I feel that SDA could react more quickly. I was expecting a more personalised service. For example it took a lot of prompting to get responses about replacement doors.
- More time should be spent on back up service from complaints.

## David Yeadon Ltd

### 1. Please explain why you rate the service provider this way?

#### Positive responses

- David Yeadon good support and understanding of schools needs re refurbishment.
- Not as much contact with David Yeadon now. However, the service is responsive when contacted. Following up not as good as when a smaller company.
- Happy with service provided. Always respond quickly to calls. Offer project management at a reasonable cost.
- David Yeadon are first rate.
- Handling of the SCIP bid - very good.
- Support with bids was good. Always assist with suppliers and contractors for small or large repairs.
- Good responsive service, very good at accessing grants so have paid for themselves over the years. Very knowledgeable. One grouse is that they don't always track the progress of things that have been agreed in discussion.
- Meetings with contractors extremely well planned and supervised. Good advice given as to cost with alternatives. Quick response to requests. Telephone advice available. Experience and skills very apparent in staff.
- The work carried out by David himself is very good. However, some of his employees are less competent in their role resulting in a service not up to Yeadon's usual high standards over this last summer.
- Contracts arranged to a high standard, help with SCIP excellent, swifter response to queries and clearer deadlines for projects.
- I have worked with David Yeadon for a number of years and find this service very supportive given the breadth of my role and responsibilities including legal aspects.
- £300k project completed in Summer 2009. Personal service is brilliant.
- There doesn't seem to be much choice between the property advice agents and so I feel that we have to go with David Yeadon.
- Prompt, swift fair service.
- Two failed SCIP bids in the last 2 years. Late payment of quotations and orders has caused problems.

#### Negative responses

- Sometimes slow on responding to requests for quotes and chasing up contractors. Increase in percentage of charge for projects has influenced decision to not renew next year.
- Cheap but poor communication.
- Quality of service has deteriorated again this year. Excellent advice given on funding sources but communication on a day to day basis can be very frustrating. In previous years, more quality assurance on contractors but we have had issues with several contractors this year.
- Project management received not enough to deliver the project on time. School has had to intervene with contractor and school does not feel we were a priority in the grand scheme of David Yeadon's contracts overall.

## AEDAS

### 1. Please explain why you rate the service provider this way?

#### Positive responses

- Expensive but a good service, no plans to change.
- Progress meetings held regularly. Plans and work to be completed always clearly explained. Snagging chased up effectively.
- Can be expensive but have given good service.
- We are a VA school and have used AEDAS this year. The service from initial enquiry to completion of building was excellent.