

UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

Open Minutes of the Meeting of the Building Committee held on 14 August 2013

Present: Mr G Howells (in the Chair), Professor R Critoph, Mr C March, Mr B Sundell, Professor L Young.

Apologies: Professor A Caesar, Professor D Elmes, Professor S Hand, Mr J Higgins, Professor K Lamberts, Professor P Thomas.

In Attendance: Mr C Carrington, Ms R Drinkwater, Ms J Horsburgh, Mrs K Jenkins, Dr E Melia, Ms L Pride, Mr M Roberts (for item 60 (part) /12-13), Mr Peter Smith (Arup), Mr M Stacey, Mr G Teasdale, Mr R Wilson.

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.

57/12-13 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Building Committee held on 14 June 2013 be approved.

58/12-13 Declarations of Interest

REPORTED (by the Chair):

That, should any members or attendees of the Committee have any conflicts of interest relating to agenda items for the meeting, they should be declared in accordance with the CUC Guide for members of Higher Education Governing Bodies in the UK.

NOTED:

No declarations were made.

59/12-13 National Automotive Innovation Campus (NAIC) (minute 42/12-13 refers)

CONSIDERED:

A paper from Mr Peter Smith, Associate Director at Arup, to consider the University's car parking strategy in the context of the National Automotive Innovation Campus (NAIC) (paper BC.23/12-13).

REPORTED: (by Mr C Carrington)

- (a) That the Stage C report for the NAIC was expected during the week commencing 12 August 2013, and that major partners would be invited to comment prior to 30 August 2013.
- (b) That the planning application for the NAIC was due to be submitted in September 2013.

(by the Group Finance Director)

- (c) That, as Chair of the Project Progressing Group for the NAIC, she intended to call a meeting of the Heads of Terms Committee during the week commencing 2 September 2013.
- (d) That it was critical to ensure that the planning application for the NAIC was right, rather than moving the project to the planning stage before it was ready.
- (e) That the Registrar had stated a preference for fewer, larger car parks on the periphery or adjacent to campus, with park and ride provision.
- (f) That it was critical that car parking provision at Gibbet Hill was extended, to improve staff satisfaction.

(by Mr Peter Smith, Arup)

- (g) That the JLR and TMETC staff members working on campus as a result of the NAIC would not have allocated parking spaces, with additional parking space demand to be met through the plans for the University's overall parking provision within the s106 limits.
- (h) That the NAIC partners had agreed to sign up to the University-wide Travel Plan.
- (i) That the Capital Programme and the Outline Masterplan approval allowed 291 extra spaces up to 2016/17 above the number of spaces that a census of University parking spaces in 2007 identified (4,974).
- (j) That, since 2009, about 175 car parking spaces had been lost from campus due to the various capital works undertaken, with a further 250 spaces to be lost in car parks 15, 4, 4A and 5, and on Health Centre Road.
- (k) That the total medium term known potential capacity was for approximately 750 car parking spaces, including both car parking space lost since 2007 and additional spaces permitted by the s106 agreement.
- (l) That a separate planning application for a 100 space car park on the Science Park may have been submitted.
- (m) That the approach to identifying locations to meet the additional car parking needs considered how to avoid unnecessary trips on University Road and easy access from the A46/Kenilworth Road.
- (n) That there was a need for provision of accurate variable message signage on availability of car parking, to direct traffic around campus appropriately, particularly for visitors.
- (o) That 14 options for the location of additional car parking were considered, and these were all assessed against a variety of criteria including appearance, cost, impact etc.

(by the Deputy Registrar)

- (p) That a clear strategy for visitor parking was required, and that the University should seek to place this off campus or on the periphery with park and ride provision.
- (q) That the increase in traffic on campus for the NAIC would be visible and that the University community needed to see this had been pre-empted and was being addressed.

(by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research (Life Sciences and Medicine) and Capital Development)

- (r) That more consideration should be given to the car parking options on the Westwood side of campus to support those accessing the campus from the A45.

(by the Director of Estates)

- (s) That they were seeking to create an access road through the 'Lynchgate Link' running towards Academic Square from the entrance adjacent to, Canon Park Tesco, for the purpose of a service route or access to car parking only, rather than providing another route for traffic to move through the campus.
- (t) That site access to the NAIC may be from Millburn Hill Road, but physical construction may impinge upon access along the existing road between Car Park 15 and the International Manufacturing Centre, the Computer Science Building and the Zeeman Building.
- (u) That the proposed development to extend Scarman House included 60-70 new car parking spaces.
- (v) That a park and ride facility would be relatively low cost, and that the current campus shuttle bus service cost approximately £30,000 per year.
- (w) That the design team's concern about the potential impact of additional single deck parking upon the Green Belt was noted, but that Car Park 1a was already constructed in such a way, was very close to Gibbet Hill Road, and the upper level could not be seen from the adjacent road and footpath due to the density of trees and hedging.
- (x) That the proposal to introduce additional capacity to car park 1A at Gibbet Hill through a single deck should be included as part of the planning application for the NAIC to be submitted in September 2013.

(by the Masterplan Architect)

- (y) That any new surface car park options would require sympathetic accompanying landscaping.
- (z) That provisional planning permission was being sought for construction on the Hurst site following the demolition of the current residential buildings, in order to maintain its use within the Green Belt.

(by the Chair)

- (aa) That the proposals for multi-storey parking options on prime site locations to address longer term capacity needs should be considered against the flexibility offered by interim surface car parking on the same sites.
- (bb) That changing the mind set of car users on campus towards the provision of park and ride facilities should in turn decrease the demand for car parking in the centre of the campus.
- (cc) That the Building Committee should establish some guiding principles to assess car parking options against, including;
 - (i) Avoid using prime sites on campus,
 - (ii) Enable flexibility by using surface parking prior to a commitment to the construction of a multi-storey car park,
 - (iii) Seek off-campus or edge of campus park and ride options,
 - (iv) Consider shorter term flexible parking options for short visits to campus.

(by the Senior Assistant Registrar (Space Management & Timetabling))

- (dd) That, given the timings of the NAIC project and its occupation from Summer 2016, it would be beneficial to commit to and pursue some car parking options immediately.

(by Mr C March)

- (ee) That consideration should be given to how similarly sized and located campuses approach their car parking strategy.
- (ff) That the provision of park and ride facilities may not appeal to students who bring their car to University because they would not wish to use public transport.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the Chair, the Director of Estates, the Masterplan Architect and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research (Life Sciences and Medicine) and Capital Development meet to consider the size, scale, designs within the Stage C Report for the NAIC, with the intention of providing feedback on behalf of the Building Committee into the design process.
- (b) That the Committee approved the further exploration of the following locations for increased car parking capacity;
 - (i) That a single deck be added to the existing Car Park 1A at Gibbet Hill (150 extra spaces).
 - (ii) That the existing surface level Car Park 2 (Bluebell) and Car Park 3 (Hurst off Leighfield Road) be extended (2 x 50 extra spaces).
 - (iii) That the site north of the existing Car Park 15 (to be removed as part of the NAIC project) identified as a potential location for a Multi-Storey Car Park become a temporary surface level car park (100 extra spaces).

- (c) That, given the potential need for further car parking capacity in addition to the locations outlined in resolution (b), the Committee approved the further exploration of single level extensions to other existing car parks.
- (d) That Arup and the Estates Office should continue to seek a peripheral site with potential as a park and ride facility.
- (e) That the Senior Assistant Registrar (Space Management and Timetabling) collate and draft guiding principles against which any proposed car parking options would be considered.

60/12-13 Campus Development Plan and Village Centre (minute 45/12-13 refers)

CONSIDERED:

- (a) A list of proposals from the Director of Campus Services and IT regarding the Piazza as discussed by the Campus and Commercial Services Group (CCSG) (paper BC.24/12-13).

***Note:** while the proposals have been discussed by CCSG, this document was yet to be reviewed by the Group. This was a draft document intended for an informal review by committees, to gain feedback and consider questions and concerns.*

- (b) A presentation of aerial images of the Arts Centre and Piazza from the Masterplan Architect, with the proposed improvements illustrated.

REPORTED: (by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research (Life Sciences and Medicine) and Capital Development)

- (a) That the CPARG had considered a presentation from the Director of Estates and Mr Peter Smith, Associate Director at Arup, on the options for the Arts Centre Plaza and the resultant impact on traffic flows, and that the Building Committee should now establish which projects could be delivered for 2015.
- (b) That any plans should match the University's academic aspirations and expectations for student experience, to include high quality teaching space.
- (c) That there was also an element of using the Piazza to increase the University's public engagement and to showcase the University and its history.
- (d) That progress was required on the bus interchange and traffic calming project, and that the CPARG had resolved that full pedestrianisation of the Piazza would not be possible given the requirements of the Section 106 Agreement.

(by the Deputy Registrar)

- (e) That paper BC.24/12-13 was created for the CCSG and therefore did not incorporate an academic view or context.
- (f) That the plan for the food and drink offer in the Piazza should increase rather than diversify existing footfall, as well as enable the interaction of staff and students with the wider community.

(by the Group Finance Director)

- (g) That the CCSG wanted the Building Committee to be aware of all forthcoming projects linked to the Piazza, and to consider their coherence and longer term consequences beyond profit and loss figures alone.
- (h) That the CCSG had concluded that it would not be possible to completely pedestrianise the Piazza area, but that the option to pedestrianise the road at “off-peak” times of the day would be welcomed.

(by the Director of Campus Services and IT)

- (i) That during the 5 Year Planning Process, the CCSG had become aware that different groups in the University had potential to duplicate aspects or miss gaps in the projects linked to the Piazza area.
- (j) That the CCSG had created a reference framework to plot the projects against (an axis between Gibbet Hill Road and the Sports Centre), and identified an end point of what the University was trying to achieve, in order to indicate whether Piazza projects were moving towards or detracting from this end point.
- (k) That it was critical that people walked through this area and encountered indicators that they were in part of a University campus.
- (l) That feedback gathered so far from the University community indicated that there was value in maintaining quiet and non-built-up areas.

(by the Masterplan Architect)

- (m) That the Masterplan already provided a framework for projects and that there was concern that this vision went beyond the framework already established.
- (n) That there should be a cohesive approach to the food and drink offer in the Piazza area.
- (o) That many of the Piazza-related projects included public realm works, and that a funding strategy was required for this activity.
- (p) That the Sustrans route would enter the Piazza and continue beyond it, with the expectation that cyclists dismount through the Piazza area.
- (q) That it was important that the Rootes kitchen facilities were moved elsewhere to enable the full development of the Piazza.
- (r) That it was crucial that at least some landscaping work be undertaken once the roundabout and new bus interchange were in place.

(by Mr C March)

- (s) That the strong Students’ Union (SU) presence on other campuses was noticeable by its absence at Warwick.

(by Mr B Sundell)

- (t) That any platform to bring in improved student experience was welcomed.

(by the Director of Estates)

- (u) That the Estates Office had commenced scheduling and the pricing of forthcoming projects linked to the Piazza, together with necessary discussions with local authorities.
- (v) That it would be possible to run a competition for artwork to feature on the new roundabouts in time for the University's 50th anniversary, noting that the piece of artwork chosen could impact upon the design of the roundabout.

(by Professor R Critoph)

- (w) That integrating teaching spaces into the Piazza area would be welcome in order to combine academic usage and increase staff footfall to the area.

RESOLVED:

That the Director of Estates work with the Group Finance Director to create a Piazza vision document, drawing together the phasing, look and feel, and link with the overall Masterplan.

61/12-13 Scarman House Extension (minute 54/12-13 refers)

CONSIDERED:

Revised designs for the Scarman House extension (paper BC.25/12-13).

Note: CCSG had not yet had the opportunity to consider these designs but would be doing so shortly alongside an updated business plan

REPORTED: (by the Director of Estates)

- (a) That there was an objection to the element of the tabled plans that stated that 25 of the parking spaces would be dedicated for staff.

(by the Group Finance Director)

- (b) That a revised business plan was expected shortly and that the Building Committee's view on the design and location was sought.

RESOLVED:

That the designs for the Scarman House extension as outlined in paper BC.25/12-13 be further considered by the Chair, the Director of Estates, the Masterplan Architect and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research (Life Sciences and Medicine) and Capital Development (who were meeting before 30 August 2013 to consider the size, scale, designs within the Stage C Report for the NAIC), with the intention of providing feedback on behalf of the Building Committee into the Scarman House designs, noting that an alternative site was being considered which would need subsequent Building Committee approval (as would the revised designs).

62/12-13 Capital Planning and Accommodation Review Group

RECEIVED:

A report summarising the main items of business from the meetings of the Capital Planning and Accommodation Review Group held on 26 June and 4 July 2013 (paper BC.26/12-13).

RESOLVED:

That the report from the meetings of the Capital Planning and Accommodation Review Group held on 26 June and 4 July 2013 (paper BC.26/12-13) be considered at the next meeting of the Building Committee.

63/12-13 Date of the Next Meeting

REPORTED:

That the provisional 2013-14 academic year Building Committee meeting dates had been set by the Deputy Registrar's Office as outlined below, and would be confirmed in due course;

Monday 21 October 2013, 3-5pm
Monday 17 March 2014, 2-4.30pm
Monday 2 June 2014, 2-4.30pm.