

ESTATES STRATEGY STEERING GROUP

20 April 2010

Q04, Witney campus

PRESENT:

Michael Chiyasa
Miranda Coles
David Doughty
Mike Gaston
Teresa Kelly
David Quayle
Terry Stock [Chair]
Sue Webb

APOLOGIES:

All members present

In Attendance:

Catherine Davies, Skills Funding Agency
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 began with welcome/introductions to Catherine Davies, Regional Head Capital Projects, Skills Funding Agency.

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 10 MARCH 2010

The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

4. MATTERS ARISING

Any matters arising would be covered within the standard agenda.

5. PROGRESS REVIEW – ALL SITES

5.1 Witney

The chair updated CD on the status of Witney project and asked for guidance on the way forward (consent process).

**Action
By**

**By
When**

The current situation was believed to be:

- 1 month for project sign off. Geoff Russell for SFA sign off; no regional sign off required.
- Lighter touch in line with Board requirements.
- Timeline for consents needed to correlate to college programme.
- CD – SFA point of contact.
- Informal sign off as we go along for each of the 3 cases (to CD).
- Account manager – Garry Llewellyn.
- Chris Birt can do borrowing consent ahead of anything else.
- Educational case to be revisited.
- Financial case – affordability issues and risk.
- Property perspective
 - value for money
 - space
 - application form (as current).
- SFA to add value to the process.
- £200m potential funds available from 2012/13
 - nothing to report on this issue
 - assume no funding available.

5.1.1 Design team appointment process

The committee noted the contents of SAW's paper.

MCC asked if CD was familiar with the IESE framework and the guidelines to be followed by the college; using NEC3 form of contract rather than JCT. MCh to send details of these guidelines to CD.

MCh

MCh to e-mail a copy of Robothams presentation to CD.

MCh

5.1.2 Business case – outline of summary document

The Chair thanked SAW for the draft outline of the business plan to go before the Corporation Board at their strategy day on 22nd May. The contents to be rearranged as follows:

- Executive summary
- Educational case
- Property case
- Financial case

Business plan to be approximately 30 pages with reference to the core documents used.

A formal Board meeting will be convened after the strategy session on 22nd May for governors to approve the next steps and the amount of funding available for the scheme.

5.2 Oakley

TK reported that a meeting had been scheduled with McIntyre. The developer is now on the site where Oakley College premises are located. The developer had proposed two possible sites for use and McIntyre will pursue these.

Carter Jonas had proposed a site at Milton Hill; although larger than required it was suitable in principle. The issue was the lease costs at

£100k pa. TK was trying to clarify with the YPLA (Sarah Rusby) the criteria set for use of the £200k. A decision on re-location of Oakley must be made within the next 4 weeks. The worst case scenario was the college could not offer the provision in the next academic year.

The annual cost for students at Oakley College is £41k compared with £89k out of county.

CD will bring this to the attention of Phil Head and David Hughes.

5.3 Abingdon

SAW reported that design plans for the refurbishment of the ground floor of D Block were on hold.

DD/TK thought it would be useful for governors to see a league table of the lifespan of the buildings.

MG thought it would be worthwhile reminding Governors of works undertaken at Abingdon in previous years.

5.4 Common Leys

MCh reported that the planning application for the polytunnel and greenhouse was deemed invalid as Common Leys was in the middle of a 'biodiversity protected zone'. MCh is seeking advice from Natural England and will report back at the next meeting.

MCh

6. ESTATES STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION COSTS

The committee noted the content of MCC's tabled report (costs to 31/3/10). There were no major concerns to report.

7. RISK MANAGEMENT

- **Objective 1.2:** deleted.
- **Objective 2.2:** deleted Options 1 and 2.
- **Objective 4.2:** deleted.
- **Objective 4.8:** increase scoring
Likelihood = 3↑
Impact (reputation) = 3↑
Score = 15↑
Priority = H↑
- **Objective 6.1:** new risk to be added 'College (Board) approval delayed'.

SButler
to update
document

30/4/10

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No items of 'Any Other Business' discussed.

9. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETINGS

5 May, 3 p.m. at Witney campus
11 June, 10 a.m. at Witney campus
14 July, 3 p.m. at Witney campus