

UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

Open Minutes of the Meeting of the Building Committee held on 2 June 2014

Present: Mr G Howells (Chair), Professor A Caesar (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (50th Anniversary)), Mr P Dunne, Mrs P Egan, Professor D Elmes, Professor S Hand, Professor N Thrift (Vice-Chancellor and President) (for items 48-57(j)/13-14), Professor P Thomas, Professor L Young (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Planning and Resources)) (from item 50/13-14).

Apologies: Professor R Critoph, Mr J Higgins, Mr C March, Mr B Sundell.

In Attendance: Dr E Bateman (Assistant Registrar, Space Management and Timetabling, and Assistant Secretary), Mr C Carrington (Head of Planning & Development, Estates Office), Ms R Drinkwater (Group Finance Director), Mr K Edwards (Head of Estates Finance, Resources and Administration, Estates Office), Ms S England (Strategic Programmes Manager) (for item 50/13-14), Dr J Gardner (Senior Assistant Registrar, Space Management and Timetabling), Ms J Greenway (Director of Corporate Finance) (for item 51/13-14), Ms L Pride (Development Plan Architect), Mr K Sloan (Registrar and Chief Operating Officer) (except item 57(a-d)/13-14), Mr M Stacey (Deputy Director of Estates), Ms C Turhan (Students' Union Representative), Mr R Wilson (Director of Estates and Secretary).

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.

48/13-14 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Building Committee held on 17 March 2014 be approved, subject to the following amendment (additions underlined, deletions struck through);

39/13-14

(...)

- (d) That it would be helpful to develop a linear programme model that would allow members of the Committee to compare the impact of one option against another in terms of, say, cost, delivery timescales and carbon emissions, to inform decision-making.

(...)

RESOLVED:

That Mr Dunne speak to the Head of Energy and Sustainability regarding the development of a linear programme model and report back to the next meeting of the Building Committee scheduled for 2 June 2014.

49/13-14 Conflicts of Interest

REPORTED (by the Chair):

That, should any members or attendees of the Building 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.

NOTE: No declarations were made.

50/13-14 Campus Movement Plan (minute 34/13-14 refers)

CONSIDERED:

A paper from the Director of Estates and the Strategic Programmes Manager regarding the tactical plans to keep the campus moving as set out in paper BC.29/13-14.

REPORTED (by the Strategic Programmes Manager):

- (a) That the paper outlined the development of a tactical plan to keep the campus moving and operational during the heavy programme of capital and infrastructure works due to take place over the next five years.
- (b) That this included a tactical car parking strategy that had been developed in response to the current pressure on car parking provision and the anticipated increase in parking demand following the completion of the National Automotive Innovation Centre (NAIC).
- (c) That during the summer of 2014 there would be reduced access to campus through the closure of parts of Gibbet Hill Road, which would require traffic to arrive at the appropriate side of campus for business as there would be no through route.
- (d) That some temporary parking would be made available beyond the barriers on Leighfield Road and Scarman Road, but that this would be available for pre-registered staff users only and that the road would not be available as a through route.
- (e) That there was a longer term need to alleviate pressure on car parking and consider future requirements.
- (f) That the tactical plan was anticipated to address the next 5 years of planned developments and that there would be continued use of a traffic management plan.
- (g) That the tactical summer 2014 plan had been developed based on modelling the daily expected demand for traffic and included peaks in traffic that were known, including Degree Congregation and Open Days.
- (h) That the mitigation plans included offering incentives, including financial incentives, to encourage members of the University to use other means of travelling to the University or taking part in a car sharing scheme.

(by the Registrar)

- (i) That it was his expectation that the Building Committee and other relevant bodies would review the medium and long term plans as they were developed.
- (j) That the Chancellors' Commission had been established in recognition of the need to work alongside other relevant regional parties to address the infrastructure and movement capabilities in the region.
- (k) That a 'Keeping Campus Moving' website had been developed that would be the official source of information and that other communications should link directly to this website.

51/13-14 National Automotive Innovation Centre (NAIC) (minute 33/13-14 refers)

CONSIDERED:

A report from the Head of Planning and Development regarding the progression of the NAIC building project, as set out in paper BC.30/13-14.

REPORTED: (by the Director of Corporate Finance)

- (a) That a meeting would be held on 4 June 2014 to finalise the contract negotiations with Jaguar Land Rover (JLR) and Tata Motors European Technical Centre (TMETC).
- (b) That there were a number of issues relating to the calculation of service charges for the National Automotive Innovation Centre (NAIC) that would also need to be resolved.
- (c) [Exempt information not included]
- (d) That the practical completion date for the NAIC building had moved considerably and was now expected to be the end of 2016.

(by the Head of Planning and Development, Estates Office)

- (e) [Exempt information not included]
- (f) That there was a concern that any further delay to the project might affect the ability to meet the HEFCE grant draw down deadline of March 2015.
- (g) That work would start on site during July 2014 to undertake an archaeological survey, with enabling works scheduled for August 2014 and the main works scheduled to start in November 2014.
- (h) That there had not been any significant changes to the overall design since it had been approved by the Building Committee at its meeting on 17 March 2014, but that further changes might be imposed through the planning approval by Coventry City Council.
- (i) That the University's financial commitment to the project had not changed.

- (j) That the Project Progressing Group (PPG) was investigating the possibility of a separate power supply to the NAIC building as the predicted power load had increased significantly from 4MW to 6.4MW and that this would be discussed at the next Project Board meeting with the partners.
- (k) That owing to a recent election, the Chair of the Planning Committee at Coventry City Council had changed and that this had been identified as a potential risk to the planning approval process for the NAIC building and the associated car parking planning application.
- (l) That if the planning application was refused, there was an intention to appeal the decision but that investment in the project could be stopped at that point since the technical design stage would be complete.

(by the Registrar)

- (m) That he would be attending a liaison meeting with the Chief Executive of Coventry City Council in order to try and mitigate the risk to the planning application.
- (n) That it would be important to rapidly engage with HEFCE regarding the funding deadline if there were any delays to the project caused by the planning application.
- (o) That the spend for the HEFCE grant was on profile and that it was the delivery date for the NAIC building that was at risk rather than the construction.

(by Professor D Elmes)

- (p) That it was important to ensure that any additional power would be taken into account as part of the University's overall energy requirements.

(by the Development Plan Architect)

- (q) That care should be taken to ensure that published images of the NAIC building were of high quality.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the Registrar and Director of Estates work with Coventry City Council in order to mitigate the political risk to the NAIC planning application.
- (b) That any changes to the design of the NAIC building that might compromise the Committee's prior approval in relation to the long term flexibility and durability of the building or the exterior design be considered by the Committee at a future meeting.

52/13-14 Central Plaza (minute 35/13-14 refers)

CONSIDERED:

An update report on the progress of public realm works on campus as set out in paper BC.31/13-14.

REPORTED: (by the Director of Estates)

- (a) That a sub-group of the Building Committee had previously been established to develop options for the Central Plaza project and that the paper outlined the concept design for the Central Plaza and the first phase of the project that would be delivered by Easter 2015.
- (b) That the Campus and Commercial Services Group (CCSG) had considered the plans and had agreed that the planned scheme for Easter 2015 was viable in terms of overall cost and timescales.
- (c) That the formal planning application would be submitted on the basis of the designs displayed at the meeting but that more detailed design work, including the use of public art and lighting would continue.
- (d) That the design included the provision of services under the Plaza area to allow for 'pop-up' facilities to be provided in the area.

(by the Chair)

- (e) That the designs appeared to include a steep slope to account for the different levels in the Plaza area and that it should be confirmed that this was manageable.

(by the Registrar)

- (f) That engagement with the Students' Union and the Campus and Commercial Services Group to increase activity in the Central Plaza area was ongoing but that the ability to plan was dependent on the approval by the Building Committee of the concept design as set out in BC.31/13-14.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the comprehensive concept design as set out in paper BC.31/13-14 be approved for submission of the planning application.
- (b) That the detailed designs for the Central Plaza project should be considered by the Committee at a future meeting, to obtain Building Committee approval.

53/13-14 Maintenance Report (minute 43/13-14 refers)

CONSIDERED:

A report outlining the prioritisation of works for the proposed five-year maintenance plans as set out in paper BC.32/13-14.

REPORTED: (by the Group Finance Director)

- (a) That the paper presented an indicative plan for University maintenance, noting that budgetary planning was still ongoing.

- (b) That she was working with the Head of Finance, Resources and Administration, Estates Office in order to take a more holistic overview of maintenance across the University in order to better understand the strategic priorities.

(by the Deputy Director of Estates)

- (c) That the paper outlined the definition of the criteria used to prioritise maintenance works and that this would be considered through the budget setting process.

(by the Registrar)

- (d) That it was important to consider the life cycle of buildings on campus as part of the maintenance planning process.

(by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Planning and Resources))

- (e) That it might be beneficial to consider the budget for the refurbishment of Centrally Timetabled Teaching Rooms (CTTRs) as part of the overall maintenance budget.

(by the Head of Finance, Resources and Administration, Estates Office)

- (f) That the holistic overview of maintenance should also include Minor Works and spends within academic departments.

(by the Director of Estates)

- (g) That the University's expenditure on maintenance compared favourably with Russell Group comparator institutions, but that the University's estate was considerably younger than many of these comparators.

54/13-14 Carbon Challenge Group (minute 39/13-14 refers)

CONSIDERED:

A paper from the Head of Energy and Sustainability, Estates Office, outlining the development of a linear programme model to inform decision making in relation to carbon emissions as set out in paper BC.33/13-14.

REPORTED: (by the Director of Estates)

- (a) That following the meeting of Building Committee held on 17 March 2014, the Head of Energy and Sustainability had met with a colleague in Warwick Business School to discuss the potential use of a linear programme model to inform decision making in relation to carbon emissions.
- (b) That the use of a linear programme model was felt to be unduly complicated for the detailed planning and implementation of the University Carbon Management Implementation Plan, but that there might be benefit in the implementation of this model at a University campus level.

(by Mr P Dunne)

- (c) That the University did not currently have a model of the campus as a joined up system.

(by the Registrar)

- (d) That there were ongoing developments to ensure that a number of planning processes were better joined up and that there was proactive engagement with users and communities across the University.
- (e) That the Campus and Commercial Services Group (CCSG) had recently implemented a Project and Programme Qualification Process to ensure that items of business were considered against a series of questions to ensure that they meet the University's needs.
- (f) That this process would be considered by Council and that he hoped that a similar process could be utilised by the appropriate committees to ensure that specific questions had been addressed prior to consideration at the meeting of Building Committee.
- (g) That it was important to bear in mind that whilst University developments continued year-round, the Committee timetable only covered 9 months of the year.

(by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Planning and Resources))

- (h) That the impact of projects on the University's Carbon Management Plan should be considered, including assessment of the overall Capital Plan to understand where mitigating action might need to be taken.

RESOLVED:

That the views of the Committee be considered as part of the forthcoming review of the University's Carbon Management Plan.

55/13-14 Chair's Business

REPORTED (by the Chair):

- (a) That he recorded his thanks to Mr Bob Wilson for his service as Director of Estates and Secretary to the Building Committee on the occasion of his last meeting of the Building Committee in his current role.

(by the Registrar)

- (b) That Mr Bob Wilson would be moving to a new role as Business Development Director (Land and Buildings) as part of the Campus and Commercial Services Group (CCSG) and that the move would allow the University to ensure the most effective long-term planning and development of its land and buildings.
- (c) That he anticipated that Mr Bob Wilson would attend future meetings of the Building Committee as part of his new role.

56/13-14 Benefactors Refurbishment

CONSIDERED:

The designs for the refurbishment of Benefactors Residences as set out in paper BC.34/13-14.

REPORTED: (by the Head of Planning and Development, Estates Office)

- (a) That it had been agreed by the Campus and Commercial Services Group (CCSG) that Benefactors Residences was in need of significant investment and that the vision was to redevelop the building to provide postgraduate and early career researcher focused accommodation.
- (b) That the designs for the refurbishment of Benefactors had been developed in conjunction with CCSG and that the budget for the project had been approved as £3.3m.
- (c) That the current estimate of costs exceeded the budget, but that the figure of £3.9m presented in the paper had since been reduced to £3.77m.
- (d) That a large proportion of the costs for the refurbishment were due to Mechanical and Electrical works.
- (e) That the planning application for the refurbishment would need to be submitted by 3 June 2014 in order to meet the completion date of March 2015.
- (f) That there was a need to replace the external cladding of the Benefactors building in order to provide thermal insulation and to improve the aesthetic appearance of the building, given that the existing tiles were falling off.
- (g) That he asked the Committee to approve the designs for the external appearance of the refurbished building on the understanding that these works were a small proportion of the overall cost and that he anticipated further changes would be requested by Coventry City Council as part of the planning approval.

(by the Registrar)

- (h) That the Benefactors building was a significant and symbolic part of the University's history, funded through an anonymous donation to foster a strong community of British and American students.
- (i) That the 29th May 1961 Charitable Trust that funded the original Benefactors building had contributed a gift towards the refurbishment programme that was conditional on the intended use of this building to provide accommodation for postgraduate students and early career researchers.
- (j) That the proposed business model for the building would allow for a budget of £3.3m, but that some further cost engineering was required to bring the project back under budget.

(by the Vice-Chancellor)

- (k) That the refurbishment of the Benefactors building would fulfil a pressing need for short-term accommodation for visitors to the University.

(by the Director of Estates)

- (l) That it might be possible to reconfigure the internal design of the refurbished building in order to provide additional bedrooms that might improve the costing of the business model.

(by Mr P Dunne)

- (m) That the possibility of allowing University alumni to purchase bricks or names on parts of the building should be explored in order to support costs.

(by the Development Plan Architect)

- (n) That it was essential that the design team work with Churchman, the University landscape architects to ensure that the plans were aligned with the overall landscape strategy for the University.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the submission of the planning application for the Benefactors refurbishment be approved, subject to a more detailed discussion with the Chair regarding the external cladding of the building and revision of the costs in line with the approved budget.
- (b) That the Campus and Commercial Services Group be invited to explore the possibility of raising additional funds through alumni donations with the Development and Alumni Relations Office.

57/13-14 Mechanochemical Cell Biology Building Extension

CONSIDERED:

The designs and construction programme for the proposed extension to the Mechanochemical Cell Biology Building, as set out in paper BC.35/13-14.

Note: That the additional designs displayed at the meeting were circulated to all members following the meeting (paper BC.40/13-14).

REPORTED:

- (a) That the planning application for the original Mechanochemical Cell Biology Building had included provision for an extension to the building.
- (b) That the research section of Warwick Medical School (WMS) that occupied the current building had grown significantly and that an extension was required to accommodate this growth in numbers.

- (c) That the proposed extension increased the footprint of the building by approximately 600m² across two floors and that there was no change in the overall height of the building.
- (d) That the planning application for the proposed extension to the MCB Building needed to be submitted soon in order to meet the proposed completion date of August 2015.

(by the Chair)

- (e) That he wished to review the designs with the Development Plan Architect following the meeting, noting that in future a design meeting should be held prior to the meeting of the Building Committee to review any designs to allow a recommendation to be made to the Committee.
- (f) That the National Automotive Innovation Centre (NAIC) building project was a good example of a process that had worked well as part of the Committee's business.
- (g) That he suggested that a smaller group of Building Committee members meet to ask direct questions of projects in advance of the main meeting of the Committee.

(by the Group Finance Director)

- (h) That the Project Progressing Group (PPG) should approve the designs in advance of the Building Committee.

(by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Planning and Resources))

- (i) That the Project Progressing Group (PPG) for the MCB Building extension had met and approved the scope and budget of the extension.

(by Professor D Elmes)

- (j) That whilst the paper indicated that the Capital Planning and Accommodation Review Group (CPARG) had approved the brief for the extension, he wanted to be sure that the location and facilities fitted with the plan for the campus and whether the extension met the University's strategy.

(by the Registrar)

- (k) That there was a missing link in the governance process that needed to be addressed, as building projects were often considered by a number of bodies.
- (l) That a proposal would be considered by the University Council that would introduce an Executive review of projects.
- (m) That the membership of PPGs should include 'external' members to scrutinise projects as part of the process, but that it might be helpful to identify members of Building Committee that could attend PPGs for the major capital projects.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the planning application for the proposed extension to the Mechanochemical Cell Biology Building should proceed as outlined in paper BC.35/13-14 and paper BC.40/13-14.
- (b) That a separate meeting be convened with the Chair, Head of Planning and Development and the Development Plan Architect to review the proposal and designs for the extension.
- (c) That the Registrar, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Planning and Resources) and the Senior Assistant Registrar (Space Management and Timetabling) would review the memberships of the Project Progressing Groups (PPGs) for major projects and bring a proposal back to a future meeting of the Building Committee.

58/13-14 Finance and Capital Projects

CONSIDERED:

The Estates Office Finance and Capital Projects report, detailing (i) the current budgetary position and (ii) progress on major capital projects and associated issues with programme delivery paper, as set out in paper BC.36/13-14.

REPORTED (by the Head of Finance, Resources and Administration, Estates Office):

- (a) That members of the Committee should note the new RAG progress report that provided a red, amber, green rating on the status of ongoing projects in relation to cost, timescales and quality.
- (b) That the Benefactors refurbishment project had been rated as 'red' on costs and that this was being managed through value engineering in order to mitigate the risk to cost.
- (c) That the delivery date for the Energy Centre project had been delayed and that this might have some impact on the cost of the University's energy usage.
- (d) That the cost of the Law School Extension exceeded the budget of £1m, but that the costs had been reduced to £1.01m and that this still contained some contingency funds.
- (e) That the Teaching and Learning Building had been rated as 'yellow' for time, cost and quality owing to the fast-track process required to deliver the building on the timescale required.
- (f) That the status of the Warwick Business School (WBS) in London project should be 'red' on cost, noting that work was ongoing to mitigate the overall cost of the project and that this would be considered by the Finance and General Purposes Committee (FGPC).

(by the Registrar)

- (g) That the cost side of projects was an iterative process between the Building Committee and FGPC and that the 'red' status of the WBS London project would be managed through FGPC.
- (h) That the RAG progress report should be included as part of the paperwork produced for other committees, including Steering and FGPC.

(by the Chair)

- (i) That the RAG progress report provided reassurance that cost, timescale and quality were being considered for the ongoing projects and that the report covered this complexity well.

59/13-14 Priorities for the 2014/15 Academic Year

REPORTED: (by Mr P Dunne)

- (a) That he felt it would be helpful to identify priority areas for discussion that the Building Committee could consider over the course of the 2014/15 academic year, for example the use of Wellesbourne campus.

(by the Chair)

- (b) That in the past the Committee had identified a thematic element to be considered at each meeting, but that this had changed over the last year owing to the increase in the volume of projects for the Committee to consider.

(by the Registrar)

- (c) That a formal 'kick-off' moment at the first meeting of the Building Committee in 2014/15 could be used to look at the shape of the year ahead and to provide background to new members of the Committee of the previous year's business.

60/13-14 Project Progressing Groups (minute 42/13-14 refers)

RECEIVED:

A report from the Head of Planning and Development, Estates Office, regarding the process for identifying chairs and members of Project Progressing Groups (PPGs), as set out in paper BC.37/13-14.

REPORTED: (by Professor D Elmes)

- (a) That he welcomed the formalisation of the Project Progressing Group (PPG) process, but that it would be helpful to have clarity on which committees the PPGs report to, and in what format.

(by the Registrar)

- (b) That the formal reporting route for PPGs was to the Building Committee, but that there was also a need for PPGs to report financially and that the current structure separated these two elements.
- (c) That it was important that the University Executive also had the opportunity to comment and feed into projects prior to consideration by the relevant committees.
- (d) That the growth of the University and the number and complexity of projects had not been fully reflected in the governance structure of the Building Committee and that there was a need to develop a more integrated approach to projects and planning.

(by the Chair)

- (e) That in view of the volume of projects being brought forward through feasibility, design and construction, he was keen for a clearer process for the Building Committee to manage design quality that would allow consideration at each stage prior to the submission of planning applications and the selection of final materials.

(by the Development Plan Architect)

- (f) That the University's Masterplan might be refreshed and that she anticipated that this would be considered by the Committee at a future meeting.

61/13-14 Date of the Next Meeting

REPORTED:

That the 2014/15 academic year committee meeting dates would be set by the Deputy Registrar's Office during the summer vacation, and would be confirmed in due course.

62/13-14 Reports from the Sub-Committees of the Building Committee

- (a) Environment and Amenities Committee

RECEIVED:

A report summarising the main items of business from the meetings of the Environment and Amenities Committee held on 16 May 2014, as set out in paper BC.38/13-14.

- (b) 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 8 April 2014 as set out in paper BC.39/13-14.