

UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

Minutes from the Meeting of the University Estate Committee held on 10
December 2014

Present: Mr G Howells (Chair), Mr R Ankcorn (Democracy and Development Officer, Students' Union), Professor D Elmes, Professor L Young (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Planning and Resources))

Apologies: Mr P Dunne, Ms P Egan, Mr K Sloan, Ms C Turhan

In Attendance: Mr J Breckon (Director of Estates and Secretary), Mr C Carrington (Deputy Director of Estates and Capital Programme Director), Ms R Drinkwater (Group Finance Director), Mr K Edwards (Chief Finance Officer, Estates), Mrs S England (Strategic Programmes Manager) (for item 24/14-15), Mrs P Glover (Director of Governance and Assurance Services), Mr W Heynes (Asset Management Director, Estates), Ms L Pride (Development Plan Architect), Mr H Rowles (Assistant Registrar (Space Management and Timetabling) and Assistant Secretary), Mr R Wilson (Director of Business Development (Real Estate), Campus and Commercial Services Group).

18/14-15 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Building Committee held on 21 October 2014 be approved.

19/14-15 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 CUC Guide for Members of Higher Education Governing Bodies in the UK.

NOTE: No declarations were made.

20/14-15 Membership of Project Progressing Groups (minutes BC.57(c)/13-14 and BC.4(b)/14-15 referred)

RECEIVED:

An oral report from the Director of Estates, providing an update on the development of Capital Programme Boards.

REPORTED: (by the Director of Estates)

- (a) That the proposals for the development of Capital Programme Boards were being progressed through discussions with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Resources and Planning), Senior Assistant Registrar (Space Management and Timetabling) and Director of Strategic Programme Delivery;

- (b) That under its new terms of reference the Capital, Space and Amenities Group would have oversight of the Capital Programme Boards and thence capital development across campus more effectively;
- (c) That the proposals would be considered by CSAG, prior to being referred to this Committee via the Steering Committee.

21/14-15 Sport and Wellness (minute BC.8/14-15 referred)

RECEIVED:

An oral report from the Director of Estates on the review of the design of the sports hub.

REPORTED: (by the Director of Estates)

- (a) That the first feasibility study was complete;
- (b) That the CABA review had been completed, providing an external challenge to the design and location of the sports facilities, noting that following the review the PPG had confirmed the location for the sports hub;
- (c) That further work needed to be carried out on the design and location of the proposed spoke sports facilities as part of the hub and spoke model;
- (d) That a strategic review of sports provision was required before the next iteration of the feasibility study.

22/14-15 Residential Accommodation (minute BC.12/14-15 referred)

RECEIVED:

An oral report from the Director of Estates on the design review process for new residential accommodation.

REPORTED (by the Director of Estates)

- (a) That the CABA review had highlighted that the current plans for townhouse-style residences at the Hurst location were unaffordable;
- (b) That there was a requirement for approximately 200 additional rooms by October 2016;
- (c) That to ensure these rooms were available on time, an expansion to Sherbourne Residences was planned;
- (d) That the exact location of the three additional blocks would be brought for consideration by the University Estate Committee at its next meeting;

- (e) That the modelled costs of the new accommodation on the Hurst site were nearly double the budget cost, at nearly £70k per room;

(by the Chair)

- (f) That land value should be included when calculating the cost-per-unit of the new residences on the Hurst site;

- (g) That it was important to consider site density when reviewing accommodation;

(by the Group Finance Director)

- (h) That the unit cost of the proposed residences would make the rental costs too high;

- (i) That work was ongoing to understand the reason for the significantly higher than expected costs;

- (j) That the proposed site for expanding Sherbourne was on or around the Tennis Courts;

(by the Development Plan Architect)

- (k) That it would be preferable to avoid building additional Sherbourne blocks on the Tennis Courts as these had recently been moved to the current location.

23/14-15 Conference Facility (minute BC.11/14-15 referred)

RECEIVED:

An oral report from the Director of Estates on the proposed flat-floor conference facility.

REPORTED: (by the Director of Estates)

- (a) That the flat-floor conference facility was on hold pending the outcome of the strategic review of Warwick Conferences;

(by the Group Finance Director)

- (b) That the flat-floor conference facility would be dependent on the Radcliffe Conference Centre for its operation, noting that there was uncertainty over the future of the Radcliffe facility given its age;

- (c) That there was a requirement for a flat-floor facility, noting that an alternative option being considered was an extension to the Scarman House Conference Centre;

(by the Chair)

- (d) That there was a need for a clear business case to ensure that the need was clear before any application for planning permission was made;

(by the Development Plan Architect)

- (e) That the current Radcliffe Conference Centre created an impediment to forming connections between the two sides of the campus across Gibbet Hill Road, making expansion onto the Warwickshire side of campus more difficult.

24/14-15 Chair's Business

REPORTED:

That since the last meeting, the Chair had taken action on behalf of the Committee to approve the initial location of a donor recognition artwork at the top of Library Road on the edge of the Warwick Business School Plaza.

25/14-15 Quality and Design Sub-Group

CONSIDERED:

A paper from the Director of Estates on the membership, operating procedures and pilot projects for the Quality and Design Sub-Group (QDSG), as set out in paper UEC.12/14-15.

REPORTED: (by the Director of Estates)

- (a) That the proposal incorporated the QDSG into the current capital project process used by Estates, with the aim of ensuring quality and aesthetics for all capital projects;
- (b) That the process would provide a robust challenge early in the project lifecycle;
- (c) That the PPG or Programme Board would determine the membership of the QDSG and the key review points;
- (d) That the process would be trialled on the Teaching and Learning Building, Residences and Sports Hub projects;
- (e) That PPGs reported to the Committee via the Capital, Space and Amenities Group, and Steering;
- (f) That more clarity was needed on the reporting structure for the QDSG;

(by the Chair)

- (g) That in his view the proposals included too many challenge gateways, making the proposal too complex, noting that the key gateways were gateways 1 and 2, examining the strategic direction, preparation and brief and concept design;
- (h) That the customer on the QDSG should be a PPG representative for planning purposes;

(by the Director of Governance and Assurance Services)

- (i) That the Steering Committee would provide a more holistic input, where relevant, to the business of the University Estate Committee and sub-committees;

(by Professor Elmes)

- (j) That PPGs picked up the general business of running a project, not the front-end decisions when establishing a project;
- (k) That the QDSG provided functional expertise available for every project, noting that PPGs should use the QDSG at appropriate times, with QDSG owning the relevant quality gateways;

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

- (l) That it was essential to ensure that the QDSG did not duplicate activity but added value to projects, noting the need to ensure clear communication between groups involved in project delivery.

RESOLVED:

That the paper from the Director of Estates on the membership, operating procedures and pilot projects for the Quality and Design Sub-Group (QDSG), as set out in paper UEC.12/14-15 be approved in principle, subject to the following:

- (a) That the Director of Estates revise the paper to demonstrate the integration of the QDSG with PPGs at key gateways;
- (b) That the Director of Estates prepare a flowchart to indicate the interaction between the QDSG, PPGs and FP18.

26/14-15 Campus Development Steering Group

CONSIDERED:

A presentation from the Director of Business Development (Real Estate), Campus and Commercial Services Group, on the Membership and Terms of Reference of the University Campus Development Steering Group.

REPORTED: (by the Director of Business Development (Real Estate),
Campus and Commercial Services Group)

- (a) That the current masterplan was approved six years ago and needed to be refreshed;
- (b) That one purpose of the masterplan was to appraise and inform local authorities of potential densities of developments on campus;
- (c) That both Coventry City Council and Warwick District Council were in the process of rewriting their local development plans, providing a good opportunity to influence local development;
- (d) That transport remained a major issue for both Coventry and Warwickshire;
- (e) That a transport sub-group met annually and was informed by the annual travel survey;
- (f) That there were a number of additional factors to consider, including the Chancellor's Commission on the future of the University, the University Strategy and the Estates Strategy;
- (g) That consideration would be given to making the campus more attractive as a destination for the wider public;
- (h) That the Local Enterprise Partnership had some funding for infrastructure;

(by the Chair)

- (i) That it would be useful to consider the actual Capital Plan in 2015 with the proposed masterplan;
- (j) That it was important to foster good will and work transparently with the local authorities;
- (k) That it was important that the masterplan was informed by and enabled the University Strategy;
- (l) That it was important for the masterplan to incorporate flexibility and capacity;
- (m) That the masterplan allowed for the maximum growth and capacity available and should not be equated with a detailed needs-based capital plan;
- (n) That there might not be significant opportunities for campus to expand in the future, noting it was important to ensure that the University did not squander its estate;

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

(o) That the masterplan needed to be flexible, noting that it also needed to support the strategy and growth of the University;

(p) That consideration needed to be given to which parts of the campus were developed for what purposes;

(by the Development Plan Architect)

(q) That the masterplan aimed to maximise capacity, noting that some parts of campus had exceptionally large buildings, while other buildings were reaching the end of their useful life;

(r) That consideration should be given to which parts of campus should be allocated for particular uses;

(by Professor Elmes)

(s) That there needed to be discussions internally as well as externally about the masterplan, covering three big themes: transport, sustainability and the approach to residential accommodation;

(t) That the National Automotive Innovation Centre could indicate the first step in constructing large collaborative buildings on campus, noting that this trend should be discussed with stakeholders.

(by the Group Finance Director)

(u) That some data to inform on the potential growth of activity could be derived from analysis of departmental five year plans;

RESOLVED:

(a) That the committee recognised the value of retaining flexibility in the campus masterplan, noting that this was a public document.

(b) That there was a need to develop an internal planning document based on the University strategy, that was need driven, rather than flexibility-driven.

(c) That the Director of Estates bring to a future meeting of the UEC a report on the potential data sources and proposed methodology to deliver a centrally-driven need-based master plan.

27/14-15 Keeping Campus Moving

RECEIVED:

An oral report from the Strategic Programmes Manager on the Keeping Campus Moving project.

REPORTED: (by the Strategic Programmes Manager)

- (a) That the aim of the Keeping Campus Moving project was to facilitate capital works and stakeholder engagement;
- (b) That the project coordinated across all projects impacting upon pedestrians, vehicles, cyclists and parking;
- (c) That the overarching strategy was to keep as many people moving through campus and the surrounding areas as possible whilst facilitating construction work;
- (d) That overall disruption had been lower than expected, with no major incidents reported;
- (e) That there was a need to further integrate Keeping Campus Moving with more capital projects in the future;
- (f) That work was being undertaken with Warwick Arts Centre to provide dedicated parking and other actions to mitigate the impact of the works as much as possible;

(by the Director of Estates)

- (g) That the project had been successful to date and needed to continue in the future, including on the Plaza and wayfinding projects;

(by Professor Elmes)

- (h) That this model was very successful and should be deployed for all future major capital projects;

(by the Chair)

- (i) That Warwick Arts Centre takings and visitor numbers had fallen as a result of the works;

RESOLVED:

That the Committee expressed its thanks to the Keeping Campus Moving team for their work to date.

28/14-15 Major Planned Maintenance Works

CONSIDERED:

A paper on the prioritisation of major planned maintenance expenditure, as set out in paper UEC.13/14-15.

REPORTED: (by the Asset Management Director)

- (a) That the priorities previously set by the Building Committee remained the same, noting that the profile of expenditure had been remodelled slightly to reflect the current condition of the University's assets;
- (b) That the age of assets across campus varied considerably;
- (c) That there was a need to review capital expenditure on existing buildings;
- (d) That the metrics used to assess the condition of buildings for the HEFCE return highlighted that no University building was in the highest class for condition, including newer buildings;
- (e) That the current methodology for reporting the condition of buildings was recognised to be coarse and required refinement;
- (f) That there was a requirement for a complete asset management process, noting that this needed to be more proactive and provide a clearer financial forecast;
- (g) That the development of the asset management process was a long-term objective and would take several years to complete;

(by the Group Finance Director)

- (h) That the maintenance budget did not include maintenance to residential buildings;
- (i) That a decision had been made to close down the Redfern residences; noting that a final decision was also due on Whitefields residences;

(by Professor Elmes)

- (j) That it could be useful to consider the maintenance procedures for some North Sea Oil facilities as these are a similar age to parts of the University estate;

(by the Director of Estates)

- (k) That there may be a need to limit the expenditure on some buildings deemed to have a short remaining lifespan;

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

- (l) That the condition survey did not reflect the different requirements of specialist spaces across the University; noting that a building no longer suitable for a very specialised use could still be useful more generally;

(by the Chair)

- (m) That the maintenance plan and condition survey should provide a high-level view of the management of the University Estate;
- (n) That there was a need to develop a University-specific condition survey, including the following items:
 - (i) Fitness for purpose;
 - (ii) Energy efficiency;
 - (iii) Shape;
 - (iv) Overall fabric of building;
 - (v) Heritage.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the paper on the prioritisation of major planned maintenance expenditure, as set out in paper UEC.13/14-15, be noted;
- (b) That the Asset Management Director develop some initial ideas on the development of a new condition survey for the University's estate.

29/14-15 Energy and Sustainability

CONSIDERED:

A paper on current and future carbon reduction targets, as set out in paper UEC.14/14-15.

REPORTED: (by the Asset Management Director)

- (a) That the University's carbon reduction targets were very challenging, noting that they had been set without allowance for the subsequent growth of the University;
- (b) That it was unlikely that the University would meet its carbon reduction targets for 2020;
- (c) That there was a requirement to set more meaningful targets for carbon reduction, taking into consideration measures of activity or space;

(by the Director of Business Development (Real Estate), Campus and Commercial Services Group)

- (d) That there was a requirement to consider full lifecycle carbon costing; noting that this could lead to some buildings requiring decommission and demolition;

(by Professor Elmes)

- (e) That Warwick was below the sector average for carbon reduction;
- (f) That carbon costs should be included in all new building costs;
- (g) That the QDSG should consider carbon and energy efficiency as part of the design process;

(by the Democracy and Development Officer)

- (h) That there was a requirement for challenging targets that were achievable and realistic;
- (i) That to maximise any savings, carbon reduction strategies should be front-loaded as far as possible;

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

- (j) That the current carbon reduction plan relied too heavily on bioenergy to meet targets;
- (k) That the increase in STEM-related activities had changed the profile of energy usage at Warwick;
- (l) That the Carbon Challenge Group had already carried out some work on this area, noting that there was potential to expand its role;

(by the Chair)

- (m) That any changes in targets would still need to meet all compliance and funding requirements;
- (n) That user behaviour had a bigger impact on carbon consumption than the efficiency of individual buildings;

(by the Group Finance Director)

- (o) That carbon needs to be included in the five-year planning process as a real cost.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the paper on current and future carbon reduction targets, as set out in paper UEC.14/14-15, be noted;
- (b) That the Director of Estates and Asset Management Director consider carbon targets, noting the work of the Carbon Challenge Group and points raised at the meeting and report to a future meeting of the Committee.

30/14-15 Capital Projects

CONSIDERED:

The Estates Office Capital Projects report, detailing (i) progress on major capital projects and associated issues with programme delivery and (ii) the status for each Project Progressing Group, as set out in paper BC.15/14-15.

REPORTED: (by the Deputy Director of Estates and Capital Programme Director)

- (a) That the new Energy Centre was not contractually complete, but was operational;
- (b) That the National Automotive Innovation Campus tender was in the process of being finalised; noting that several value engineering options were being considered, including a change to the façade of the building;
- (c) That on-site works for the Teaching and Learning Building were due to start in February or March 2015;
- (d) That work had begun on a revised feasibility study for the Mathematical Sciences extension to the Zeeman Building;
- (e) That the contractor for the car parking project would be selected at the end of the week;
- (f) That the WMG UKRPIF Steel bid had been resubmitted, noting that there might be a different model with the building now split across two smaller facilities;
- (g) That WMG had submitted proposals for a new Engineering Workshop to the Capital, Space and Amenities Group for consideration; noting that this would be presented at the next meeting of the Committee;
- (h) That regular meetings had been scheduled with WMG to understand their capital and infrastructure requirements;

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

- (i) That the bid for HEFCE STEM funding for CAVE2 in the Teaching and Learning Building had been unsuccessful, noting that the building would still be equipped to a very high standard;
- (j) That there were logistical issues with the new WMG Engineering Workshop due to the number of other developments planned for that area of campus, including the car park and extension to the Zeeman Building;

- (k) That WMG had agreed to produce two-five and 10 year plans to outline their requirements for capital developments and infrastructure;

(by the Director of Estates)

- (l) That work was underway to identify temporary car parking at Gibbet Hill, noting that the current plans to extend the car park were twice as expensive per space as the new car park on main campus;
- (m) That car parking needed to be considered as part of a wider redevelopment of the Gibbet Hill campus;
- (n) That the proposed Arts Centre 20:20 project needed to move to the next stage of planning to enable external funding to be secured;

(by the Group Finance Director)

- (o) That a revised capital plan for the Mechanochemical Cell Biology Building Extension would be submitted to FGPC in January;
- (p) That the proposed Arts Centre project would be funded by £5m from Warwick, £5m from the Arts Council England and £5m from fundraising.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the Committee the Estates Capital Projects report, as set out in paper BC.15/14-15, be noted;
- (b) That the Director of Estates arrange for a sample of the proposed new façade for the NAIC to be erected for consideration by the Committee at its next meeting.

31/14-15 Date of the Next Meeting

REPORTED:

That the next meeting of the University Estate Committee would take place on Thursday 29 January 2015 at 11:00am in the Council Chamber, Senate House.