

**John Wheatley College**  
**Board of Management**  
**Project Management Group**

**Minutes of the Project Management Group meeting held on Wednesday  
11 October 2006 at 12.30pm at the East End Campus.**

**1. Sederunt**

The meeting commenced at 12.30pm and was attended by:

Andy Woolley (Chair);  
Ian Graham (Principal);  
Alex Kirk (Depute Principal);  
Professor Arthur Allison (from 12.40pm onwards);  
Ann MacDonald (co-opted member);  
Jim Cope (co-opted member);  
Lori McElroy (co-opted member);  
Jim Coleman (co-opted member) (from 12.40pm onwards);and  
Martin Axford (co-opted member).

**In Attendance:**

Sharon De Sykes (Capita Symonds);  
Alan Sherry (Assistant Principal); and  
Sylvia Vaughan (Committee Co-ordinator).

**2. Apologies**

Andrew Macdougall  
Colin White  
Fiona McDade  
Sheila Reddix

**3. Declarations of Interest**

The Chair declared an interest in respect of items 7a(i) (Landscape Proposals – Scottish Enterprise Glasgow) and 11 (Financial Report: Report Number 16 – 6 October 2006\*) as a result of his employment by Scottish Enterprise Glasgow and his membership of the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) Property and Capital Investment Committee.

**4. Terms of reference**

Members noted the terms of reference for the Project Management Group. It was confirmed that the meeting was quorate with 9 members in attendance.

## **5. Minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2006**

The minutes were accepted as an accurate record of the meeting held on 20 September 2006.

## **6. Matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting held on 20 September 2006**

There were no matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.

The Principal requested that A Sherry ensure that the Post Capital Project Evaluation Exercise Report which was considered at the 7 September 2006 meeting of the College's Capital and ICT Committee was considered at the next meeting of the Project Management Group. He informed members that the College had secured a deal with the People's Palace, which would enable it to display pictures in the Haghill Campus.

## **7. Correspondence**

### **a) Landscape proposals**

#### **(i) Scottish Enterprise Glasgow**

The Depute Principal spoke to the contents of the correspondence from Brian Fitch (Senior Development Executive, Scottish Enterprise Glasgow) which highlighted some concerns that Scottish Enterprise Glasgow had expressed regarding the landscape proposals for the Haghill Campus. He explained that these alluded to the absence of a maintenance strip adjacent to the building, the potential inappropriateness of the plants proposed for this area and the steepness of the slopes at Carntyne Road, which would make it difficult for the landscaping to be maintained in accordance with the Construction (Design and Management) (CDM) regulations 1994.

Members noted the contents of the correspondence.

#### **(ii) John Wheatley College**

The Depute Principal spoke to the contents of his response to Brian Fitch (Scottish Enterprise Glasgow) which confirmed that he had asked the Planning Supervisor and HBG Construction to investigate the concerns which had been raised.

Members noted the contents of the correspondence.

#### **(iii) Planning Supervisor**

The Depute Principal spoke to the contents of the correspondence from Paul Graham (Project Manager, Capita Symonds' Health and Safety Access Consultancy) to David Cruse (Ahrends Burton and Koralek) which requested clarification of the methods considered and means of access incorporated for the cleaning and maintenance of windows and the maintenance of plants surrounding the building.

Members noted the contents of the correspondence.

**(iv) Planning Supervisor**

The Depute Principal spoke to the contents of the correspondence from Paul Graham (Capita Symonds) which alluded to the correspondence considered under item 7 (iii) and confirmed that Capita Symonds would work with Ahrends Burton and Koralek to resolve the concerns which had been highlighted. A Kirk assured members that he was content with the progress with regards to this issue.

Members noted the contents of the correspondence.

**8. Minutes of Project Meetings**

The Chair requested that items 8 a (i), 8 (b) and 8 (c) be considered together.

- a) (i) Progress Meeting Number 9 – 13 September 2006**
- b) Client Review Meeting held on 13 September 2006**
- c) HBG Progress Meeting Number 9 – 13 September 2006**

Members noted the contents of the minutes.

**9. Project Status Reports**

- i) Progress Report No. 22 - August/September - 2006**

S De Sykes spoke to the contents of the report and confirmed that the project was progressing well and remained on schedule. Members considered the contents of the Executive Summary.

**Professor A Allison and J Coleman entered the meeting at 12.40pm.**

S De Sykes reminded members that following the approval of the planning application on 1 February 2005, amendments to the planning conditions were submitted by the architect on 18 August 2006 to the City Council. She reported that a progress meeting regarding the planning application had been held on 11 October 2006 and that only a small number of minor issues remained to be resolved by Buro Happold.

Members were also reminded that the Stage 2 building warrant for substructure, superstructure and drainage works was granted on 11 January 2006, and that changes since the Stage 2 warrant were being dealt with as an amendment to the warrant which had been submitted to Building Control on 16 June 2006. S De Sykes further reported that further information had been requested by Building Control and that this was being progressed.

She informed members that soil samples taken from the proposed site of the attenuation tank had evidenced that the soil was inert. S De Sykes reported that Glasgow City Council's Landfill Department was willing to transport the soil to Greenoakhill landfill site, at a cost of £30 per 20 tonne load. Members noted that this cost was included in the tender quote.

The Project Manager informed members that a contractor had been appointed to build the attenuation tank and associated works and that the detail of this would be considered under agenda item 13.

S De Sykes reported that ASB had now installed the spray paint booth in the workshop block.

In response to questions, she assured members that she was content with the recent field observation report which had been produced by the Clerk of Works and opined that the contractor was responding well and in a timely manner when matters were raised with regard to the quality of work.

In response to an enquiry from the Chair, A Kirk agreed that HBG continued to meet the quality standards established by the contract.

S De Sykes further reported that there were some minor issues regarding the reception desk and the hairdressing areas which remained to be resolved with the architects, however these would not impact on the construction programme.

Members subsequently agreed to note the contents of the progress report.

**10. Cost Report Number 6 – Not Yet Available\***

The Depute Principal informed members that Cost Report Number 6 was not available at this stage.

**11. Financial Report: Report Number 16 – 6 October 2006\***

**Members agreed that due to the commercial-in-confidence nature of the information contained in this report that it would not be placed in the public domain at this juncture.**

**The Chair reminded members that he had previously declared a conflict of interest with regards to this item as a result of his employment by Scottish Enterprise Glasgow.**

The Depute Principal spoke to the contents of the financial report, which was last revised on 6 October 2006. He reported that there had been few alterations to the report since it was considered at the Project Management Group meeting on 20 September 2006.

A Kirk informed members that the grant body to which the College would apply for funding for photovoltaic cells had altered the format for applications and that Buro Happold would submit the application in the revised format during October 2006. In response to questions, he informed members that that the necessary funding for this equipment remained available, however the application required to be re-submitted.

Members noted that the current cost of additional work instructed on HBG was £216,096.08.

In response to questions, the Depute Principal informed members that the College had received the final costing for the Chinese Granite flooring which would be in the region of £50,000 and that he had made provision for this cost within this report. He also informed members that the College's Associate

Principal (ICT) was currently working on the ICT specification for the building, including the broadband link. In response to a request from the Chair, A Kirk agreed to ensure that R Boyd's report on the broadband link, which was considered at a recent meeting of the College's Capital and ICT Committee, was updated for consideration at an appropriate future meeting of the Project Management Group.

A Kirk reported that the issue of the replacement of lighting columns was currently being examined by Glasgow City Council.

He informed members that there had been little change to the expenditure on the new build project since the previous Project Management Group meeting held on 20 September 2006. Members noted that £101,714 was currently set aside for contingencies.

The Depute Principal informed members that Hunters (Scotland) Ltd had produced a tender for the provision of furniture for the Haghill Campus which met the quality threshold and was 30% below the other tenders which had been received. He intimated that as a result the College intended to appoint Hunters (Scotland) Ltd as the furniture contractor for the Haghill Campus. The Principal further informed members that Hunters (Scotland) Ltd was a local company, which was also ISO 14001 accredited.

I Graham reminded the Project Management Group that the College was still actively seeking further funding to enhance the East End Campus and had recently submitted applications to the Garfield Weston Foundation and the Big Lottery Fund. He indicated that the Big Lottery Fund had declined the College's proposal in its current format, but that both he and A Sherry intended to meet with representatives from the Fund in the near future to discuss how best to revise the bid to meet the requirements of this body.

The Principal further reported that with A Sherry he would work on a supplementary ERDF application in due course, as it was anticipated that further funding would be available from this source due to de-commitments from other projects.

Members agreed to note the contents of the report and its appendices.

## **12. Scottish Funding Council Monthly Project Reports**

The Depute Principal informed members of the fifteenth monthly project report, which would be submitted to the SFC on 12 October 2006, as required as a condition of grant. He reported that 66% of the project had been completed and that 62.73% of the overall cost had been committed.

Having heard the Depute Principal, members agreed to:

- i) note the contents of the report and its appendices;
- ii) note the change of cost information forwarded to the SFC; and
- iii) agree the submission, to the SFC, of monthly report number fifteen dated 12 October 2006.

### **13. East End Campus – Off-Site Drainage**

The Depute Principal spoke to the contents of the report which apprised members of the progress on the scheme for site drainage. He reported that the lowest cost tender organisation had been the College's preferred contractor for the additional drainage work, but this company had subsequently withdrawn its tender due to pressure of work. A Kirk reported that Doig and Smith had subsequently been instructed to contact the next lowest cost contractor, which was ERDC and that this contractor had now been appointed. He reminded members that the College had obtained planning permission for the attenuation tank and the consent of Scottish Water.

He also informed members that the section 56 application had been submitted and would be returned in the week beginning 16 October 2006.

A Kirk reported that ERDC had been asked to examine the traffic management plan and that representatives from ERDC intended to meet representatives from the police to discuss this issue in the near future.

The Principal further commented that representatives from the College would meet with representatives from the police in the near future, in order to discuss the transport issues.

Members agreed to:

- i) note the contents of this report and its appendix; and
- ii) request the College to provide regular updates on this element of the project.

### **14. East End Campus – Early Warning Notices**

The Depute Principal informed members that 42 Early Warning Notices (EWNs) had been reported to previous meetings of the Project Management Group and that numbers 43 to 46 had been raised to 6 October 2006. He reported that the College no longer intended to install either an additional washing-up trough (EWN 43) or light switches in the floor of the administration office (EWN 44). A Kirk proceeded to highlight EWNs 45 and 46, which were that the plywood backing to the Siberian Larch would require to be fire treated and that a timber base would be erected for the sound booths. He indicated that neither EWN 45 nor EWN 46 would have any impact on the programme.

Members subsequently agreed to:

- i) note the contents of this report and its appendix; and
- ii) request the College to bring forward further reports on Early Warning Notices at future meetings of the Project Management Group.

## **15. East End Campus – Project Manager Instructions**

The Depute Principal spoke to the contents of the report, reminding members that 95 Project Manager Instructions (PMIs) had been reported to previous meetings of the Project Management Group and that no PMIs had been raised to 6 October 2006.

Members agreed to:

- i) note the contents of this report and its appendix; and
- ii) request the College to bring forward further reports on Project Manager Instructions at future meetings of the Project Management Group.

## **16. East End Campus – Compensation Events**

The Depute Principal spoke to the contents of the report which apprised members that no Compensation Events had been raised to date. Members agreed to:

- i) note the contents of this report; and
- ii) request the College to bring forward further reports on Compensation Events at future meetings of the Project Management Group.

## **17. East End Campus – Cafe Facility**

The Depute Principal reported on the appointment of the Scottish Purchasing Partnership Limited to tender the cafe facility at the Haghill Campus on the College's behalf. He stated that of the 9 organisations which were originally invited to tender to operate the cafe, both 7Day Catering and Catering Academy had since withdrawn from the tender process. A Kirk also reported to members that he had met with David Smith (Scottish Purchasing Partnership Limited) on 10 October 2006 to discuss the tenders and that representatives from the 7 organisations had toured the site of the Haghill Campus. He informed members that the closing date for tenders was 8 November 2006 and that a shortlist of 3 companies would be drawn up by the Project Management Group at the meeting on 15 November 2006. The Depute Principal informed members that the tender process took into consideration a range of factors, including quality, menu range, sustainability and fair trade.

The Principal reminded members that the cafe would be open to the public. A Kirk emphasised the fact that the College would not receive any revenue from the café and that the successful contractor have a five year agreement to provide the agreed services.

In response to questions, the Depute Principal informed members that the contractor would also supply in-house hospitality for meetings at cost.

Members agreed to:

- i) note the contents of this paper and its appendix;

- ii) note the timetable of events in relation to the tender for the cafe facility in the East End Campus; and
- iii) request the College to bring forward further information as it becomes available.

#### **18. East End Campus – Risk Register (Standing Item)**

The Depute Principal spoke to the contents of the report, which presented the East End Campus Risk Register as it currently stood and invited members to review and revise the Register if necessary. It was agreed that no changes to the Register were necessary. S De Sykes confirmed that the risk associated with drainage attenuation would remain high until the College secured section 56 approval. The Principal opined that the design of operational IT systems still represented a significant risk.

Members subsequently agreed to:

- i) note the contents of this paper and its appendix;
- ii) note the contents of the College's Risk Register for the East End Campus;
- iii) consider the completeness of the Risk Register;
- iv) consider the grading of each risk identified; and
- v) request the College to bring forward the Risk Register at each scheduled meeting of the Project Management Group.

#### **19. Closure**

The meeting closed at 1pm, with the Chair thanking all members for their contribution. The Chair noted that this was the last meeting that would be attended by A MacDonald, since A MacDonald was leaving Parkhead Housing Association and thanked A MacDonald for her valuable contribution to the work of the Project Management Group.

#### **20. Date of next meeting**

The next meeting will be held on 15 November 2006 in the Alex Viola Suite, Easterhouse Campus.

**\* This item will not be placed in the public domain at this juncture due to the confidential nature of its contents.**