

Remote Access Symbols

-  Dialed in
-  Online

Minutes Part I

Estates Committee
Part I minutes

Meeting Time and Date	0900 on 22 June 2020
Meeting Location	Zoom Online
Members	Roger McClure (Chair)  Paul Campbell Beryl de Souza  Malcolm Goodwin (Principal)  Sarah Seery (Staff Governor)  Carl Butler (Student Governor)  Jarryd Russell (Student Governor)  Cara Glynn (Co-opted Student Governor)
Observers	Christine Bianchin (Academic)  Susanne Datta (HR)  Damien Fallon (Finance)  Steven Girling (Estates) 
Minute Taker	Joanne Coffey (Clerk) 

z:\governance\health & safety committee (hs)\hs mins + ma\mins 20171121.docx

	Action
<p>1. Apologies and Introduction</p> <p>1.1. Apologies were received for Paul Campbell and Cara Glynn.</p> <p>1.2. This was the inaugural meeting of the Estates Committee which combined estates matters from Finance and Resources with the full Health and Safety Committee.</p> <p>1.3. It was agreed that the Committee would benefit from new members with non-executive expertise in project management, planning and finance, specifically for London. The Estates Director to investigate current networks for suitable candidates.</p>	Estates
<p>2. Declaration of Interests</p> <p>2.1. None.</p>	
<p>3. Minutes</p> <p>Resolved to</p> <p>3.1. Approve the minutes of the Health and Safety Committee meeting held on 10 March 2020 as a correct record and authorise the Chair to sign them.</p>	
<p>4. Matters Arising</p>	

<p>4.1. The term ‘Ongoing’ is being replaced with the expected date of completion for all matters arising.</p> <p>Jarryd Russell joined the meeting.</p> <p>4.2. Most of the Business Continuity Plan (BCP) had been completed.</p> <p>4.3. The tree surveys were making good progress.</p> <p>4.4. The Gardening Which? lease had been agreed and signed.</p>	
<p>5. Accommodation strategy review (Decision)</p> <p>5.1. The College’s accommodation strategy was being reviewed after 3 years to align with the College’s current strategic ambitions.</p> <p>Beryl de Souza joined the meeting.</p> <p>5.2. It was agreed that the existing accommodation strategy contained many useful principles and ideas that should be retained, but should be renamed the Estates Strategy to encompass land, premises, buildings and facilities.</p> <p>5.3. Capel is spread across London with relatively complex premises and estates, and many choices of projects that could not all be afforded at the same time. It was agreed that the replacement document should be a working document which can be readily flexed and updated in the light of sometimes rapidly-changing circumstances.</p> <p>5.4. The statement of intent to be drafted to emphasise sustainability and the environment, in the sense that buildings should be as ‘green’ as possible.</p> <p>5.5. The Committee were invited to email the Principal and Estates Director if they felt that any matters had not been covered.</p> <p>Resolved to</p> <p>5.6. Confirm that The Executive Director of Estates and Commercial Operations is asked to create a new Estates Strategy for review by the Strategy Committee.</p>	<p>Estates</p> <p>Estates</p>
<p>6. Review of Estates Risk (Decision)</p> <p>6.1. In light of the COVID-19 impact on risk, it had been agreed by the Audit Committee for the Risk Register and the Principal Risks to be updated to include the risk and mitigation of online teaching, home working, commercial digitisation and cyber security.</p> <p>6.2. The Committee discussed the concept for all new builds to have flexible learning spaces, where all areas are enabled by technology as opposed to a single IT suite.</p> <p>6.3. As the student experience during the pandemic, and subsequent academic achievement and progress, had relied on robust IT</p>	

<p>systems, the infrastructure needs to be safe, secure and always available.</p> <p>Resolved to</p> <p>6.4. Confirm that the principal risks represent the main internal and external risks and remain fit for purpose.</p>	
<p>7. Crystal Palace and Mottingham Concept (Information)</p> <p>7.1. The College is working to establish an alternative concept for its south London campuses given the planning difficulties associated with the current design proposals.</p> <p>7.2. Alternative plans were to redevelop the farm site at Crystal Palace with some teaching accommodation but with the majority of a new build project at the Mottingham campus. The Greater London Authority (GLA) / Mayor's Office were fully aware of this route and currently these alternative plans were in the pre-application stage with Bromley Council.</p> <p>7.3. If the pre-application plans were accepted, the GLA would be formally approached in August 2020 with concepts and a request to provide the same proportion of funding support as the existing project. Proposals will be considered by the LEAP and a response was expected from the LEAP in September 2020.</p> <p>7.4. As the original plans to fully redevelop the Crystal Palace site incurred high costs, SLT were committed to ensuring this does not get repeated and were being wise to ensure that the Crystal Palace plans have no negative impact on the Mottingham plans.</p> <p>7.5. Transport to and from Mottingham for existing Mottingham staff and students had been considered and was not thought to be an issue. There is ample parking and it is a 20-minute walk from the train station. For those staff and students potentially transferring from Crystal Palace, there are no direct transport links so minibuses are likely to be utilised once COVID restrictions are reduced. Feedback to be sought from Crystal Palace staff and students to clarify what their transport needs would be.</p> <p>7.6. A possible masterplan for Mottingham is being developed based on flexibility to gradually grow the site as provision develops. Environmentally friendly modular buildings, that can be added onto later, will provide flexible rooms and layouts based on guided learning hours and the projected headcount. The potential masterplan will be shared and discussed with Mottingham staff at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>7.7. The Staff Governor felt that the Mottingham plans were more exciting and realisable, compared to what had been originally planned at Crystal Palace.</p> <p>7.8. The Crystal Palace farm site should, as a consequence of the Mottingham plans, have a lower overall risk due to a reduced new</p>	<p>Academic / Estates</p> <p>Principal / Estates / Academic</p>

<p>build requirement. The majority of single storey structures would be fully refurbished which requires no planning consent.</p> <p>7.9. During any building work, students will not be impacted as the building work will be contained to a separate compound. At this stage it was not anticipated that any classroom spaces would be taken out of circulation to enable this project.</p> <p>7.10. The remaining budget for the redevelopment was £8.2m and the new build cost based upon the stated size and scale for the Mottingham campus would be approximately £5.5m. This would leave approximately £2.7m for further refurbishments at Mottingham and the Crystal Palace farm site, e.g. the Glasshouse at Mottingham.</p>	
<p>8. All Programme Review (Decision)</p> <p>8.1. The College has limited staff and financial resources available to develop and grow the College sites. The All Programme Review (APR) is intended to provide Governors and SLT with a balanced view on the costs, benefits, risks and issues for each of the projects under consideration.</p> <p>8.2. The APR directly links to the College’s strategy to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Be an expanding College. b) Provide the best possible range of resources. c) Be a consistently outstanding College. <p>8.3. The Committee discussed the ownership of the projects with an overall Project Manager and a Project Team for each campus / project.</p> <p>8.4. A masterplan should be developed and maintained for each site and should link to the APR. At all future meetings, the Estates Committee will consider a fully populated version of the APR to comment on each of the projects including planning and project management.</p> <p>8.5. There needs to be good communication and overlap between the Finance and Resources Committee, the Estates Committee and the Strategy Committee. Projects which have been agreed as strategic priorities by the Board will be worked up in detail by the Estates Committee, under financial guidance from the Finance and Resources Committee, and ultimately will require financial approval from Finance and Resources before final approval to proceed is sought from the Full Governing Body.</p> <p>8.6. The role of the Strategy Committee is horizon scanning and proposing to the Board, on the basis of the work of the other committees and other inputs such as strategy away days, what should be the College’s priorities in the medium and longer terms. Ultimately, the College’s strategy and the annual operating plans that flow from it, will be determined by the Governing Body.</p>	<p>Estates</p>

<p>8.7. The Strategy Committee should consider the strategic links and overall prioritisation based on delivering key academic outcomes and enabling College growth, value for money, timescale and anticipated risks and issues.</p> <p>Resolved to</p> <p>8.8. Agree the format and structure of the All Programme Review, and the sequence of committee responsibilities and approvals leading to final approvals by the Governing Body.</p>	
<p>9. Report of the Estates Director (Information)</p> <p>9.1. The campuses that had re-opened had been made COVID-secure with robust safeguarding, health and safety measures put in place, based on detailed risk assessments.</p> <p>9.2. Commercial activities remained closed, with gardens being the first area planned to reopen from July 2020. Friends of Capel will be invited to attend during the first weekend in July and if successful the opening will be scaled up.</p> <p>9.3. The Regent’s Park lease permitting the siting of the garden lodge in the inner circle has been approved by Westminster council to retain the Capel building on site for a further 3 years.</p> <p>9.4. The London Borough of Bromley (LBB) were considering a direct lease to the College for the Crystal Palace farm site, rather than via the GLA. As LBB are the freeholder. It is expected to be a peppercorn rent and a longer-term assurity of tenure.</p>	
<p>10. Report of the Health and Safety Officer (Information)</p> <p><u>Business Continuity Plan</u></p> <p>10.1. The Business Continuity Plan (BCP) had been completed for all campuses, which involves gold, silver and bronze level teams operating at strategic, tactical, and operational levels.</p> <p>10.2. The pandemic had created its own practice run which had confirmed it was fit for purpose. Post-COVID, a ‘lessons learned’ exercise will be performed to fine tune the BCP.</p> <p>10.3. The BCP was currently stored on an internal drive and all Campus Managers had access to an offsite hard copy. To ensure access at all times, the BCP is to be stored in the Cloud with password access.</p> <p><u>Staff and Student Safety</u></p> <p>10.4. The Governors were impressed with the content and speed at which the ‘New ways of working’ guidance that had been provided to students and staff, following a full risk assessment by SLT. The guidance will be reviewed following any new Government advice.</p>	<p>Estates</p>

Remote Access Symbols

-  Dialed in
-  Online

Minutes

Part II (Declassified)

Estates Committee
Part II minutes

Meeting Time and Date	0900 on 22 June 2020
Meeting Location	Zoom Online
Members	Roger McClure (Chair)  Paul Campbell Beryl de Souza  Malcolm Goodwin (Principal)  Sarah Seery (Staff Governor) 
Observers	Christine Bianchin (Academic)  Susanne Datta (HR)  Damien Fallon (Finance)  Steven Girling (Estates) 
Minute Taker	Joanne Coffey (Clerk) 
z:\governance\health & safety committee (hs)\hs mins + ma\mins 20171121.docx	

	Action
<p>1. Apologies</p> <p>1.1. Apologies were received for Paul Campbell.</p>	
<p>2. Declarations of Interest</p> <p>2.1. The Staff Governor remained present for the Part II meeting, as there were no staff conflicts of interest.</p>	
<p>3. Matters Arising</p> <p>3.1. The College were still awaiting a response from the council regarding the proposals to include the greenbelt land at 66 Ridgeway in the council's call for sites, and a private developer's bid to develop 66 the ridgeway in conjunction with their land for commercial housing. Both matters sit with LB Enfield.</p>	
<p>4. Confidential Estates Report (Decision)</p> <p><u>Enfield Foundation Learning Building</u></p> <p>4.1. The College made a successful £250k match-funding bid (50:50 or £125k each party) with the GLA for a two classroom structure designated for Foundation Learning students at Enfield. This was included in the master plan for Enfield when there was an increase in demand for foundation courses.</p> <p>4.2. It was clarified that the £250k does cover all costs for the project including the technology fit out.</p>	

<p>4.3. Governors considered the validity of such a project given that a deficit was forecast and the initial plans had been made pre-COVID.</p> <p>4.4. As the project was likely to increase the provision for Foundation Learning students, the project was agreed, in principle, that its context remained aligned to strategic intent but this was subject to the review of all other projects in the “All Programme Review”.</p> <p>4.5. It was agreed that all quotes, deadlines and a planning review should be in place before Finance and Resources review it against the budget before the project proceeds further.</p> <p>Agreed to</p> <p>4.6. It is recommended that the Estates Committee support an “in principle” decision to continue with the Foundation Learning Building, subject to a response from the GLA about start dates and subject to the approval from the Finance and Resources Committee</p> <p><u>Mottingham and Crystal Palace Park Project</u></p> <p>4.7. With a change in scope of the Mottingham and Crystal Palace project, the cost effectiveness of the current architects was re-established through a tender exercise with 4 architect practices.</p> <p>4.8. The incumbent architects, Feilden and Fowles, through the tendering exercise had significantly reduced their fees by £45k. They also had the advantage of understanding the detailed requirements of the project, had good working relationships with the College and the rest of the project team, and had already completed much of the work necessary to take the project to RIBA stage 2.</p> <p>4.9. For these reasons the project board felt that Feilden and Fowles should continue.</p> <p>4.10. The fees were also VAT exempt as they related to 16-18 year old provision.</p> <p>4.11. The Committee also agreed with retaining the architects, on the agreement that payments are staged so that the College is not financially committed beyond the stage that is reached.</p> <p>Agreed to</p> <p>4.12. It is recommended that the Estates Committee approve the continued appointment of Feilden and Fowles as the architects for the Crystal Palace and Mottingham Project.</p>	<p>Estates</p>
<p>5. AOB</p> <p>5.1. None.</p>	
<p>6. Date of next meeting</p>	

<p>6.1. The next Estates Committee meeting will take place on 23 November, 2020.</p> <p>6.2. The Clerk to ensure that future Estates meetings are scheduled to take place prior to the Finance and Resource Committee meetings, to ensure that recommendations can be passed through prior to the Governing Body meetings.</p>	<p>Clerk (Completed)</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

APPROVED MINUTES			
CHAIR:	Roger McClure	DATE:	23 November 2020
APPROVAL:	Remote confirmation: CONFIRMED		
	Or signed:		