

ESTATES STRATEGY STEERING GROUP

10 March 2010

Q04, Witney campus

PRESENT:

Michael Chiyasa
Miranda Coles
David Doughty
Mike Gaston
Teresa Kelly (Items 1 - 5.2)
David Quayle
John Raftery (Item 5.1)
Terry Stock [Chair]
Sue Webb

APOLOGIES:

All present

In Attendance:

Andrew Foster, Robothams (Item 5.1)
Dave Robertson, Capita Symonds (Item 5.1)
Sara Butler (Minuting Secretary)

AGENDA

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apologies 2. Declarations of Interest 3. Minutes of last meeting 4. Matters arising 5. Progress Review – all sites | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Estates Strategy Implementation Costs 7. Risk Management 8. Any other business 9. Date of next meeting |
|---|--|

SUMMARY AND ACTION POINTS

The meeting started with a presentation from Robothams/Capita Symonds (Item 5.1). John Raftery, Chair of the Corporation Board, was present for this item.

David Quayle was welcomed to his first meeting.

1. APOLOGIES

All members of the group were present.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest reported.

3. MINUTES OF MEETING DATED 3 FEBRUARY 2010

The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

4. MATTERS ARISING

Any matters arising would be covered within the standard agenda.

**Action
By**

**By
When**

5. PROGRESS REVIEW – ALL SITES

5.1 Presentation on Witney options

Six weeks ago, Andrew Foster from Robothams had been commissioned to conduct a masterplanning and options study for the Witney campus. He had looked at the affordability of 6,500m² with a mix of refurb and new build with the potential for expansion on site at a future date. After looking around the decommissioned buildings, he came away with a more positive feeling; the state of the buildings could be classed as either first stage of a refurb project or ready for demolition.

Four options were presented on how this could be achieved. Options C&D, which included more new build, were ruled out as they were unaffordable.

Option A – would restrict future development on campus.

Option B – had been revised to allow future construction access from the service road. Refurbishment does not mean second best and could still achieve a very good sustainability target. All exteriors could be treated to create a family of buildings with a sense of purpose. Landscaping would be the key to making this work as it was relatively low cost and would give the site a sense of quality.

Robothams had asked Capita Symonds (Cost Consultants) to cost out Options A and B at a high level. Two papers were tabled outlining costs:

- Witney Campus Masterplan 2010 – Costs/Areas Schedule
- Professional Fees Indicative Cash Flow – OGC Fee Apportionment

2 fundamental procurement options were available:

- OJEU programme route – assuming Corporation Board decision this month, design team on board by July 2010 and building delivered by April 2012.
- OGC procurement route – framework OJEU compliant, intended for any public funded projects. If design team appointed April 2010, occupation of buildings could be December 2011.

The Chair thanked AF/DR for their input.

SAW/MCh/Robothams had arranged to meet WODC planners the following week to discuss the options for Witney campus and the preferred option. It would be more effective to present them with one option. WODC were nervous that the hoardings would remain in situ for a lengthy period with no development on site. Option B was the preferred option as this maximises future proofing for the site.

MCC to take governors through implications and exposure to college of £7.5m scheme.

The Chair believed the biggest single risk to be Board approval as theoretically the governors could defer or not approve the project.

SAW reported that the LSC (soon to be SFA) Property Advisor would like to be kept informed regarding key milestones.

TK – fundamental issue for the SFA is they need to be assured about financial solvency of the college going forward.

TK – the financial risk to the end of the financial year is £250k. TS – test the LSC and say we are going ahead as a business. JR – need to know sooner rather than later. SAW agreed to draft a letter for TK to send to Phil Head urgently.

SAW

JR asked what would happen at Abingdon if £7.5m was put into the Witney site. SAW/MCh looking at remodelling of the entire ground floor of D block at Abingdon over the next two years. Governors need to know that if we continue with Witney there will be some funds for Abingdon.

John Raftery, Robothams and Capita Symonds left the meeting.

5.2 Briefing paper from LSC meeting on 3/3/10

The group noted the content of MCh's briefing notes from the meeting with the LSC's Catherine Davies (from 1st April she will be the SFA Regional Property Advisor).

TK left the meeting to attend a meeting in Oxford.

5.3 Progress report

The content of SAW's progress report was noted. The group recommended that the contract with T&T was formally terminated before moving forward with the new procurement strategy.

6. ESTATES STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION COSTS

The group noted the content of MCC's latest report.

The costs for purchase of temporary accommodation will appear in the February report.

MCC

A different spreadsheet format with new codes will start when the new scheme progresses.

MCC

MCC would capitalise costs wherever possible.

MCC

7. RISK MANAGEMENT

The group noted the current risk plan and believed it to be an accurate portrayal for where we are at present. Following the Corporation Board meeting on 25th March several risks would potentially change subject to decisions made.

SButler

20/4/10

The Board to be asked to formally abandon the Abingdon scheme to completely redevelop the campus.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No items of 'Any Other Business' discussed.

9. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

20 April 2010 at 12.30 at Abingdon campus

