

UNIVERSITY ESTATE COMMITTEE

Open Minutes of the meeting of the University Estate Committee held on 9 December 2015

Present: Ms R Drinkwater (Group Finance Director) (Acting Chair), Professor D Elmes (until item 30/15-16), Ms T Elliott, Professor S Hand (until item 27/15-16), Mr I Leigh (President, Students' Union), Mr O Rice (Democracy and Development Officer, Students' Union).

Apologies: Professor D Haddleton, Mr G Howells, Mr K Sloan, Mr R Wilson, Professor L Young.

In Attendance: Mr J Breckon (Director of Estates and Secretary), Mr C Carrington (Capital Programme Director, Estates), Mr K Edwards (Chief Finance Officer, Estates), Ms S England (Strategy Programme Manager) (until item 24/15-16), Mr W Heynes (Operations Director, Estates), Ms L Pride (Development Plan Architect), Dr E Melia (Senior Assistant Registrar (Space Management and Timetabling) and Assistant Secretary), Mr H Rowles (Assistant Registrar (Space Management and Timetabling)), Mr P Smith (Associate Director, Arup) (until item 24/15-16).

Note: Some items are noted as "Exempt information not included" as they contain information that would be withheld from release to the public because an exemption under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 applies.

20/15-16 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the University Estate Committee held on 3 November 2015 be approved.

21/15-16 Conflicts of Interest

REPORTED:

That, should any members or attendees of the University Estate Committee have any conflicts of interest relating to agenda items for the meeting, they should be declared in accordance with the Committee of University Chairs (CUC) Higher Education Code of Governance (2014).

NOTE: No declarations were made.

22/15-16 Gibbet Hill Road and Benefactors New Road Layouts (minute 6/15-16 referred)

RECEIVED:

A report from traffic consultants TMS on the review of the Gibbet Hill Road and Benefactors Place pedestrian schemes, as set out in paper UEC.10/15-16.

REPORTED: (by the Director of Estates)

- (a) That the report had been carried out by TMS and considered at the Plaza Project Progressing Group, noting that a number of actions had been agreed for Gibbet Hill Road and Benefactors Place, which would be implemented before the end of January 2016.
- (b) That monitoring was underway to understand usage of the various styles of crossings in use along University Road.
- (c) That all traffic for the new Multi-Storey Car Park (MSCP) would enter campus via the Lynchgate Road, not through main campus.

(by the President, Students' Union)

- (d) That student feedback indicated a preference for the shared space design being extended along the entirety of University Road.

(by Professor D Elmes)

- (e) That the aim for a mixed-use, low-speed area on central campus would necessitate moving the majority of traffic to the periphery of campus.

(by the Mr P Smith)

- (f) That the space used some of the principles of shared space, noting that due to the inclusion of kerbs it was not a true shared space, but that it did provide enhanced pedestrian facilities.

(by Ms T Elliot)

- (g) That increased effort needed to be applied to improving pedestrian travel and public transport links, noting that pedestrian flows should be a high priority and all projects should be designed around this aim.

(by the Capital Programme Director)

- (h) That as part of the MSCP project a new roundabout would be installed on Lynchgate Road, with traffic calming measures and central reservations for pedestrians, noting that this work was due to be carried out in 2016.

23/15-16 Toar Cottage and Westwood Bungalows (minute 10/15-16 referred)

CONSIDERED:

A paper from the Operations Director (Estates Office) on the condition of Toar Cottage and the Westwood Bungalows earmarked for demolition to support the University's car parking expansion, as set out in paper UEC.11/15-16.

REPORTED: (by the Operations Director (Estates Office))

- (a) That all of the buildings indicated contained significant amounts of asbestos, noting that none of the buildings were listed.
- (b) That due to the condition of the buildings, they would need to be demolished even if these areas were not earmarked for car-parking provision.

RESOLVED:

That the demolition of Toar Cottage and the Westwood Bungalows be approved.

24/15-16 Travel and Transport Strategy (minute 10/15-16 referred)

CONSIDERED:

A presentation from Peter Smith, Associate Director, Arup on progress in implementing the University's Travel Plan.

REPORTED: (by the Mr P Smith)

- (a) That the travel plan was initially developed alongside the University's current masterplan in 2007.
- (b) That approximately half of the traffic along Gibbet Hill Road was non-University traffic.
- (c) That there were a number of proposed residential developments in the locality of the University, noting that any development on the King's Hill site would necessitate the upgrading of Gibbet Hill Road, Kenilworth Road and the A46, and could possibly result in the construction of a new railway station.
- (d) That the University had succeeded in reducing the number of staff and students arriving by car and increasing the use of public transport in line with the travel plan, but that it was recognised that further improvement was required to ensure that car parking demand was managed and congestion around the campus reduced.

(by Ms T Elliott)

- (e) That the interchange between rail and bus services was vital, noting that significant improvements, particularly in signage, could be made at Coventry, Leamington Spa and Birmingham International railway stations.
- (f) That, if necessary, the University could purchase advertising space at the local railway stations to raise the profile of transport links to the campus.
- (g) That the quality of the public transport interchanges, particularly between local railway stations and bus services limited the radius of the area from which staff and students would commute by public transport to the University.
- (h) That the refresh of the transport strategy should be more ambitious with stretching internal targets for modal shift.

(by the Development Plan Architect)

- (i) That it was essential that demand for car parking be reduced as the ratio of spaces to area of new buildings was not sustainable in the long term.

(by the Strategy Programme Manager)

- (j) That there were currently 4,637 car parking spaces on campus, noting that under the existing section 106 agreement a maximum of 5,422 spaces were permitted.

- (k) That the improvements to the bus interchange presented the opportunity to encourage other national coach service providers divert routes via the campus to improve transport links.

(by the Democracy and Development Officer, Students' Union)

- (l) That one of the main barriers to increasing utilisation of public transport was its perceived unreliability, particularly at peak times during term time, noting that the volume of traffic around the campus was often cited by bus companies as the principal cause of delays to the timetable.

(by Professor S Hand)

- (m) That the lack of quality public transport to the campus, particularly to or from other cities such as Oxford and Birmingham caused issues for staff satisfaction, recruitment and retention.

25/15-16 Works of Art on Roundabouts

CONSIDERED:

A paper from the University Curator on a proposal for works of art to be installed on campus roundabouts, as set out in UEC.12/15-16.

REPORTED: (by the Operations Director (Estates Office))

- (a) That Coventry City Council was working with the University to support the transition of verges and roundabouts in the area around campus to being maintained by the University, noting that this provided the opportunity to install works of art on local roundabouts.
- (b) That the planned installations would support the wider Art Collection strategy and provide a sense of location and entrance to the campus.

(by the Democracy and Development Officer, Students' Union)

- (c) That the emphasis on commissioning work from local and younger artists was welcomed.

(by Professor D Elmes)

- (d) That the plans could be developed further to enhance the curatorial ambitions of the University and the Art Collection.

RECOMMENDED: (to the Art Collection Committee)

That the roundabout sites be prioritised for the purchase and installation of new works of art, starting with the Kenilworth Road/Gibbet Hill Road roundabout.

26/15-16 Branded Monoliths

RECEIVED:

A paper from the Operations Director (Estates Office) to inform the Committee of the plan to replace the branded monoliths on the entrances to Westwood, Gibbet Hill, Main campus and Wellesbourne incorporating the new University brand, as set out in UEC.13/15-16.

REPORTED: (by the Operations Director (Estates Office))

- (a) That the new monoliths would reinforce the 'sense of place' of the University and would replace the current monoliths with the new University brand.
- (b) That the potential monolith locations had been chosen to be near to nodal points and the entrances to the University, noting that not all of the sites would be developed based on the overall budget and physical restrictions of the sites.
- (c) That the images were designed to reflect the new brand, noting that as the monoliths would be internally illuminated, planning permission would be required.
- (d) That the monoliths had an anticipated lifespan of 12-15 years.

(by the Development Plan Architect)

- (e) That the locations and designs would need to align with the proposed art installations on the roundabouts near the campus, noting that many of the proposed sites were close to roundabouts.

(by Ms T Elliot)

- (f) That the signage should be checked to ensure that the word "University" was clearly visible to occupants of vehicles.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the Operations Director (Estates Office) consult with the University Curator and ensure that the locations and designs of the monoliths align with the roundabout art proposals.
- (b) That an updated be brought to the meeting of the University Estate Committee to be held on 9 February 2016.

27/15-16 Demolition Plans

CONSIDERED:

A paper from the Operations Director (Estates Office) on proposals for the phased demolition of a number of life expired buildings on Westwood campus and the Science Park, as set out in UEC.14/15-16.

REPORTED: (by the Operations Director (Estates Office))

- (a) That the buildings on Westwood proposed for demolition were some of the worst condition properties on campus, noting that there was significant asbestos contamination in all of the buildings highlighted in the paper.
- (b) That the Graduate Studies Building was only partially occupied due to recently identified structural faults.
- (c) That the buildings identified for phase one of the demolition plan could remain vacant and unoccupied for a short period of time, noting that over a longer period these buildings would become a health and safety and security risk.

- (d) That none of the buildings were suitable for a significant refurbishment due to internal structural issues.
- (e) That a paper would be presented to the Finance and General Purposes Committee in January 2016 outlining the budget required to undertake the demolitions.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That phase one of the demolition plans, as set out in paper UEC.14/15-16 be approved.
- (b) That a decant strategy to facilitate phase two of demolition be developed and considered by the Capital, Space and Amenities Group.

28/15-16 Student Residences

CONSIDERED:

- (a) A report from the Director of Estates on proposals for new Manufactured Off Site student residences on the Westwood campus as considered by the University Council at the meeting held on 25 November 2015 and set out in paper UEC.15/15-16.
- (b) An oral report from the Director of Estates on the progress of plans for construction of additional Sherbourne student residences.

REPORTED: (by the Director of Estates)

- (a) That the traditional construction methods used by the University for student residences were resulting in unacceptably high costs per room, noting that this would result in very high student rents.
- (b) That there was a requirement for over 1,000 additional bedrooms on campus in the near future.
- (c) That construction of additional blocks of Sherbourne residences had been re-tendered, noting that the prices were expected to be slightly lower in the next round of tenders.
- (d) That the modular solution proposed for Westwood had been used at both Newcastle and Nottingham universities, noting that while the interior of the rooms was an acceptable standard, the exterior did pose some concerns.
- (e) That adopting a modular solution would enable the completion of the rooms by January 2017, noting that this would then enable a process of refurbishment works in some existing residences.
- (f) [Exempt information not included]
- (g) That it could be possible to reduce the costs of traditionally constructed residences by constructing residences in large volumes.
- (h) That the masterplan for Westwood needed to be developed to provide direction for further buildings on the campus.

(by the Chair)

- (i) [Exempt information not included]
- (j) That the aim was to provide high-quality accommodation at affordable prices for students, noting that it was important to consider modular construction alongside traditional methods.

(by the Democracy and Development Officer, Students' Union)

- (k) That there were concerns about the provision of affordable student accommodation, particularly for final year students.
- (l) That accessibility and sustainability should be key factors in any future development of residences on campus.

(by the Development Plan Architect)

- (m) That the building design was not attractive, noting that there were other modular solutions available with a better appearance.
- (n) That there would be significant opportunity to develop on the Westwood campus following the proposed phased demolition, noting that the proposed site for the residences would significantly limit the options for further development of the campus.

(by Professor D Elmes)

- (o) That the proposed construction was not in keeping with other developments on campus, noting that the green space around residences negated the need for a central courtyard in a residential building.
- (p) That the Committee would need to establish a set of design standards against which any future proposed modular construction buildings could be measured.

RECOMMENDED: (to the Finance and General Purposes Committee)

That funding be released for the construction of the additional residences at Sherbourne, subject to the receipt of satisfactory tender submissions.

RESOLVED:

That the Estates Office continue to investigate modular options for the construction of student residences.

29/15-16 Warwick Sport (minute 8/14-15 referred)

RECEIVED:

A paper from the Capital Programme Director on progress of the design of the new sports facilities including the Sports Hub, as set out in UEC.16/15-16.

REPORTED: (by the Capital Programme Director)

- (a) That the project was in the concept phase, noting that the paper had also been considered by the Quality and Design Sub Group (QDSG).

- (b) That the QDSG had challenged the architect on the orientation and location of the proposed sports hub.

(by the Director of Estates)

- (c) That the project had been reviewed at several meetings of the QDSG to ensure that it tied into the overall campus masterplan and infrastructure.
- (d) That the development of the design of the Sports Hub was well aligned with the campus masterplan, noting that the project architects were engaging with the Development Plan Architect and the Landscaping Architect.

(by the Democracy and Development Officer, Students' Union)

- (e) That the project provided an opportunity to provide more gender neutral spaces.

30/15-16 Quality and Design Sub-Group

RECEIVED:

- (a) A summary report and minutes of the meeting of the Quality and Design Sub-Group (QDSG) held on 3 November 2015, as set out in paper UEC.17/15-16.
- (b) An oral report from the Capital Programme Director on the outcomes of the meeting of the QDSG held immediately prior to the meeting of the University Estate Committee.

REPORTED: (by the Capital Programme Director)

- (a) That the QDSG had challenged the architects of the Arts Centre project to provide more detail about the key elements of the project, noting that the architects had produced a presentation that answered the key concerns.
- (b) That the architects for the Mathematical Sciences Extension had been challenged on their design, noting that an update would be considered at the next meeting of the QDSG.
- (c) That the QDSG was having a positive impact on the design of projects across campus.

31/15-16 Capital Projects

CONSIDERED:

The Estates Office Capital Projects report, detailing progress on major capital projects and associated issues with programme delivery and the status for each Project Progressing Group, as set out in paper UEC.18/15-16.

REPORTED: (by the Capital Programme Director)

- (a) That at the next meeting of the Committee he would provide images to highlight the progress of key projects.
- (b) That Benefactors had been delayed due the discovery of asbestos, noting that this had affected both the timing and cost of the project.

- (c) That the University of Warwick Engineering Workshop (UWEWE) was slightly delayed due to contractor issues.
- (d) That the National Advanced Steel Innovation Centre was in abeyance while confirmation of partner funding was secured.

(by the Chief Finance Officer (Estates Office))

- (e) That no risks had been highlighted as increasing on the report.

32/15-16 Planned Maintenance

RECEIVED:

A paper from the Chief Finance Officer (Estates Office) outlining the major planned maintenance five year plan, as set out in UEC.19/15-16.

REPORTED: (by the Chief Finance Officer (Estates Office))

- (a) That the maintenance schedule was informed by physical inspections, reactive maintenance, strategic planning, prioritisation and funding availability.
- (b) That the funding had been levelled across the five-year plan, noting that there would be some years of higher and lower expenditure, depending on the exact nature of the work carried out during each financial year.

33/15-16 Framework Procurement Strategy

RECEIVED:

A paper from the Chief Finance Officer (Estates Office) on the development of a procurement strategy for the sourcing of works projects and associated consultancy, as set out in UEC.20/15-16.

REPORTED: (by the Chief Finance Officer (Estates Office))

- (a) That proposed change to the procurement strategy would establish a robust framework for more partnership-based procurement which would be in place mid-2016 to enable its use on major projects from 1 August 2016.

(by the Director of Estates)

- (b) That other institutions, including the universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Manchester had established a similar framework.
- (c) That the framework would have Key Performance Indicators for contractors and the values would encourage the use of local businesses.

(by Ms T Elliot)

- (d) That the London 2012 Olympics had utilised a similar framework for procurement.

34/15-16 Date of Next Meeting

REPORTED:

That the future meetings of the Committee for the 2015/16 academic year were as follows:

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Tuesday 9 February 2016 | 2.00-4.30pm, Senate House Council Chamber |
| Tuesday 12 April 2016 | 2.00-4.30pm, Senate House Council Chamber |
| Monday 20 June 2016 | 2.30-5.00pm, Senate House Council Chamber |

As at 8 January 2015