
















Remote Access Symbols

-  Dialled in
-  Online

| |
|--------------------------|
| Estates Committee |
| Minutes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Meeting Time and Date | 1000 on 17 November 2021 |
| Meeting Location | Zoom Online |
| Members | Roger McClure (Chair)  Dr Beryl de Souza  John Gayer Ralph Luck  Sarah Moreland MBE  Stephen Way  Malcolm Goodwin (Principal)  Sarah Seery (Staff Governor)  Rosie Evans (Student Governor)  Michael Sinnett (Student Governor) Layla Jane Rashid (Student Governor) |
| Observers | Peter Doble (Papers only) Jill Sinclair (Reserve Student Governor)  Christine Bianchin (Academic)  James Bryan (HR) Damien Fallon (Finance)  David Scott (Estates)  |
| Minute Taker | Joanne Coffey (Clerk)  |
| z:\governance\meetings and minutes\minutes by committee\es mins\es mins 20211117.docx | |

| | Action |
|--|---------------|
| <p>1. Welcome and Apologies</p> <p>1.1. Apologies were received for John Gayer, Michael Sinnett, Layla Jane Rashid and James Bryan.</p> <p>1.2. The Student Governors were welcomed to the Committee, including Reserve Student Governor, Jill Sinclair, who deputised for Michael Sinnett.</p> | |
| <p>2. Declaration of Interests</p> <p>2.1. None.</p> | |
| <p>3. Minutes (Decision)</p> <p>Resolved to</p> <p>3.1. Approve the minutes of the Estates Committee meeting held on 21 June 2021 as a correct record and authorise the Chair to approve them.</p> | |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>4. Matters Arising (Information)</p> <p>4.1. No matters arising from the minutes were discussed.</p> | |
| <p>5. Report of the Estates Director (Decision)</p> <p><u>Estates Strategy</u></p> <p>5.1. The Accommodation Strategy was reviewed in June 2020 and, as a result of that review, it was agreed to rename it as the Estates Strategy.</p> <p>5.2. The draft Estates Strategy supports the over-arching strategy of the College, in a high-level format, kept broad to guide the College through the next two years when more is known about the physical working practices that work best with the post-Covid environment.</p> <p>5.3. The Strategy Committee received the Estates Strategy on 11 November 2021 and key feedback was shared at this meeting, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Although Governors agreed that the high-level strategy provided the headline strategies, they felt that the more detailed plans that sat behind the strategy should be included in the document for more clarity to external bodies or partners that may use the strategy for their own investment analysis. b) They also requested that it tied in with the Academic Strategy for context on planned expenditure and to map out why Capel is best suited to certain areas of London, or not. c) The Strategy did not need to be as detailed as some of the Estates Committee reports but it needed to give enough detail for Governors who do not sit on this Committee, so moderate detail is required. d) It was suggested that external expertise could be sought to provide clarity on what should be included from an FE/investor perspective in terms of, for example, assisting with bids for grant funding. <p>5.4. The Strategy Away Day, being held on 7 February 2022, will establish the strategic plan for the next three years and this will influence the more detailed content of the Estates Strategy.</p> <p>5.5. Some of the information in the College's more detailed condition surveys and the All Programme Review might be incorporated into the Strategy to provide more substance.</p> <p>5.6. These more operational documents may help evaluate and assess the contribution and future of its sites.</p> <p>5.7. The Estates Committee had a full and broad discussion on how the Estates Strategy should be developed and the following was agreed:</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Estates</p> |

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| <p>a) To balance the volume of detail against what is helpful, in terms of clarity of direction, for the audiences that the Estates Strategy will serve.</p> <p>b) As Capel is different to many other FE colleges in terms of its breadth and depth of estates, with landlord and local authority restrictions, it should include a strategic evaluation of each Capel campus, which assessed their strengths and weaknesses and overall fit with the College’s mission and strategic objectives. For clarity on how the site works for Capel, it could include assessment against a set of criteria, such as lease information, quality of premises, opportunities and threats, etc., to facilitate decisions about how income is invested.</p> <p>c) As staff need clarity on what any new estates development means to them and their day to day work, clear outlines should be made to separate what is aspirational and what is actually in process. This was key to ensure against any staff de-motivation from disappointment when projects, they have assumed are happening, get withdrawn or put on hold.</p> <p>d) To highlight the potential for any staff and student involvement with any new projects. This will both enrich the student experience and make it more meaningful to everyone, as they take ownership of what is being developed.</p> <p>e) To express that the College undertakes regular surveys to ensure that learning and commercial activities are being realised to their full potential.</p> <p>f) To include the visual of campuses on a London map (from the previous Accommodation Strategy), to demonstrate the balance of Capel sites versus competitors.</p> <p>g) To consider use of an external consultant in planning the Estates Strategy.</p> <p>5.8. Following discussions of specific site issues, later in the meeting, Governors suggested that the site analyses for the Estates Strategy could include rag rated risk for impact on learning, recruitment and other areas of consequence. This could then create tangible links back to the learners and staff, to reflect on their KPIs.</p> <p>Resolved to</p> <p>5.9. Recommend to the Governing Body that the high-level Estates Strategy be developed as outlined above.</p> <p><u>Staffing</u></p> <p>5.10. The position of Centre Coordinator for the Regents Park campus has been filled by Andrew Jackson who has extensive prior experience in the same role. The Centre Administrator role is currently vacant and being advertised for.</p> <p>5.11. Recruitment problems resulted in support staff issues occurring at Crystal Palace and Regents Park campuses. This has now been</p> | <p>A: Governing Body</p> |
|--|---------------------------------|

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>stabilised with temporary use of agency staff and actions are in place to fully resolve staff shortages.</p> <p>5.12. The Staff Governors agreed that current recruitment processes, including limitations from the HR software, iTrent, had not supported the campuses well and they welcomed the planned improvements to these processes.</p> <p><u>66 Ridgeway Enfield</u></p> <p>5.13. The transfer of the covenant appertaining to this property has now been completed and the sum of £600,000 (before fees) has been received. The College Legal expenses associated with the transaction were around £13,000.</p> <p>5.14. The College is deeply indebted to an independent consultant who offered an invaluable service to the College through his advice and guidance in regard negotiating tactics with both the owner of the land and their developers. In recognition of this, it was being proposed to the Governing Body, via the Finance and Resources Committee, to offer the consultant a remuneration of £25,000 for their involvement over the fifteen months' period of negotiation.</p> <p>5.15. The consultant had been initially introduced to the College, informally, to offer free advice. This then unfolded into many hours of work due to the complex and specialist nature of this area. Having not arranged this on a fee paying basis, management felt that, as the consultant had been invaluable in negotiating the £600k, that it would be right and proper to gift the sum of £25k to the consultant.</p> <p>5.16. The Committee supported the making of a gesture of goodwill, in recognition of the service rendered, but in the absence of a contract, asked the executive to prepare a quantified rationale for the amount.</p> <p>5.17. The College's external auditors will advise on how the payment should be processed to ensure regularity.</p> <p>5.18. The College was currently analysing which capital projects to invest these proceeds in.</p> <p><u>Health and Safety update</u></p> <p>5.19. As this Committee received a standalone 'Update from the Health and Safety Officer' report, it was agreed that it was unnecessary to repeat any health and safety updates in the Report of the Estates Director.</p> <p><u>Sustainability</u></p> <p>5.20. The College has engaged with a specialist sustainability consultancy 'Bemari' to progress the sustainability agenda and provide an action plan for implementing actions leading to net zero emissions.</p> <p><u>Post 16 Capacity Fund</u></p> | <p>Estates</p> |
|--|-----------------------|

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| <p>5.21. The College had been informed that its bid for £706,000 was unsuccessful. The feedback has been noted and will be useful in refining future bids.</p> <p><u>Mottingham and Crystal Palace Development</u></p> <p>5.22. A submission has been made to the EFCS Capital Transformation Fund for £2,570,820 representing 29% of the total project cost. The award decision is expected in February/March 2022 but it is hoped an indication in regard to the College submission may be available late November 2021.</p> <p>5.23. The Committee were updated on the Mottingham and Crystal Palace project time line which remained flexible until the funding decision outcome.</p> <p>5.24. It was agreed for the Estates Committee to visit the Mottingham site again for further visual updates. This may be aligned with an FEC visit on 9 December 2021, otherwise a separate date will be organised.</p> | <p>Clerk</p> |
| <p>6. Report of the Principal (Information)</p> <p><u>Enfield Visitor Entrance</u></p> <p>6.1. The Committee were updated on the background to the Enfield Visitor Centre/Gateway Building, which had developed into a £6m project which then required substantial College investment in plans before significant fundraising could ensue.</p> <p>6.2. As the Gateway Building (or similar such scale construction) which had included a second student entrance would remain financially out of reach for some time, an alternate proposal is being developed to construct a lower cost second entrance that is more achievable and liberates the main reception for students and ultimately, the Hessayon building for replacement.</p> <p>6.3. The Staff Governor was hugely supportive of this change and the Committee agreed that it was more achievable and aligned better with the College's commitment to sustainability.</p> <p><u>Pangaea Garden</u></p> <p>6.4. The College are initiating a major new garden project as an opportunity to open up an unutilised area to the public and students, which will create a new attraction in the Gardens to bring more visitors and create a space for commercial lettings.</p> <p>6.5. This will be a fundraised project which will be led by the Patron.</p> <p>6.6. The Staff Governor thought it a good project and observed that it would complement the Terraflora Garden at the Gunnersbury Park campus.</p> <p><u>Gunnersbury Park</u></p> <p>6.7. The College has been in significant discussions with Ealing Council, and one of the two trusts that oversees the Community Interest Company, that is Capel's landlords, regarding its</p> | |

presence, future and the ongoing relationship with Gunnersbury Park.

- 6.8. Capel reached its capacity for students at Gunnersbury Park about 3 years ago. The College has made it clear that we would like to expand the accommodation if possible and would like a relationship with the park more along the lines of a partner rather than a tenant.
- 6.9. Options being discussed include: occupation of the small mansion to teach garden design, floristry, garden history etc. and; a restored 'model farm' where many of the animals could be relocated. These options would free up teaching space in the walled garden, either for teaching or horticultural restoration.
- 6.10. Together, this would allow the College to expand and strengthen its provision in Gunnersbury Park although the path ahead is far from clear and of course, it would be costly. Alternatively, the College is having exploratory talks about other potential sites in west London that would provide a long-term, secure option and room to expand.
- 6.11. The Committee discussed the challenges and complexities of dealing with two separate London Borough councils and two trusts.
- 6.12. The College continues to have ongoing support from a former Governor who is involved with Friends of Gunnersbury Park. It has also invited the operational management of the park to the College to provide more perspective and strengthen the relationship but this has not yet been taken up.

Regent's Park

- 6.13. Discussions are underway about the College's long-term future in The Regent's Park. The Royal Parks team have expressed their keenness to continue to accommodate Capel in the Queen Mary's Gardens Yard, where the College is already situated, but it has not been able to agree on more extended options.
- 6.14. There may be other ways to expand using existing buildings through a "Trustee led Project Board" which the College is currently examining.
- 6.15. The Staff Governor emphasised the need for adequate digital infrastructure. This was logistically challenging in such a large greenspace and had impacted the current Regent's Park student experience for those buildings closer to the Inner Circle. Projects to update bandwidth at Regent's Park (and Gunnersbury Park) were underway.
- 6.16. Separately, the College recently proposed that London needed an urban adaptation centre to advise on how a major City can deal with rising temperatures. Many potential partners have shown interest and a formal potential location for the centre is being explored.

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p><u>Barking Riverside</u></p> <p>6.17. The Barking Riverside project was continuing to develop, with the new railway now in place. It remained a good strategic fit for the College to build a new campus, but this remained aspirational.</p> <p>6.18. Land originally offered for consideration was found to be contaminated for reclamation / development. A new area next to the railway station had been offered instead and, although realising such a big project for the College was a long way off, it would be an ideal fit with Capel’s strategy for east London coverage.</p> <p><u>Sustainability</u></p> <p>6.19. It was clarified that the hiring of the sustainability consultancy, Bemari, had been via a rigorous tendering process. They were evaluated as insightful and stood out well from the competition.</p> <p><u>Recruitment challenges</u></p> <p>6.20. Recruitment had become a national issue post-Covid, where people had been reassessing their working lives.</p> <p>6.21. The College had changed its recruitment strategy in 2020 to a more rigorous process that required approval by line managers, HR, Finance and the Principal. Its computerised nature had held some requests up whilst it went down the approval line. The College was now considering a simpler system to ensure that staff vacancies are expedited.</p> | |
| <p>7. Estates Policies (Decision)</p> <p><u>Health and Safety policy</u></p> <p>7.1. The College Health and Safety Policy now included the College’s mitigation for legionella and asbestos. Separate policies were also created to deal with the detailed processes involved.</p> <p>7.2. Contextual changes and title changes had also been made throughout the document. The Chair of Governors had noted some grammatical errors which would be corrected by email.</p> <p><u>Legionella and Asbestos policies</u></p> <p>7.3. The Legionella Policy and Management Plan and the Asbestos Management Policy are new policies to the College. There is no legal requirement for either of these policies but they provide transparency that the College properly manages these areas.</p> <p>7.4. The policies provide the practical framework necessary to meet statutory requirements, including specific staff responsibilities.</p> <p>7.5. As staff are only informally aware of these responsibilities, they will be contacted following approval of the policies, formal letters will be sent and training will be supplied to fully support them in these additional responsibilities.</p> <p>7.6. Governors felt that the letters should be reassessed to ensure that they did not create any employee contractual issues. This</p> | <p>Estates</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>was agreed and will be put in place before staff are communicated to.</p> <p>7.7. It was clarified that the College has always operated an asbestos register for all of its sites (which it updates over the summer period), which contractors regularly request. It was agreed to include this action in the Annual Plan.</p> <p>Resolved to</p> <p>7.8. To agree the Health and Safety, Legionella and Asbestos policies and recommend them to the Governing Body for approval.</p> | <p>Estates</p> <p>Estates</p> <p>B: Governing Body (Appendix I)</p> |
| <p>8. Report of the Health and Safety Officer (Information)</p> <p><u>Accident and Incident Reports</u></p> <p>8.1. The mis-labelled report was renamed Paper 8, rather than 9.</p> <p>8.2. The Committee discussed further mitigations that could be put in place to warn visitors, particularly young children accompanied by their parents, that the farm animals may bite if they are touched.</p> <p>8.3. Notices are clearly displayed but the College were assessing the installation of a second barrier. This would need to offer physical protection whilst not obliterating the view of the animals which would reduce the visitors' experience.</p> <p><u>Health and Safety Committee minutes</u></p> <p>8.4. Centres were not currently being as well represented at the new Health and Safety Committee meeting as desirable. To ensure broader coverage, staff were being asked to only give apologies when there were urgent reasons.</p> <p>8.5. Governors suggested that unavailable staff could provide a written feedback to the meeting. However, it was felt that a deputy would be a more suitable replacement and that this would be easier to arrange once the open roles had been recruited for.</p> | <p>Clerk (Completed)</p> |
| <p>9. AOB</p> <p>9.1. None.</p> | |
| <p>10. Date of next meeting</p> <p>10.1. The next Estates Committee meeting will take place on Monday 7 March, 2022.</p> | |

| APPROVED MINUTES | |
|-------------------------|--|
| CHAIR: | Ralph Luck DATE: 7 March 2022 |
| APPROVAL: | Remote confirmation: CONFIRMED Or signed: |