

John Wheatley College

Project Management Group

Minutes of the Project Management Group meeting held on Thursday 20 January 2005 at 12.30pm at the offices of Capita Symonds, St Andrews House, 141 West Nile Street, Glasgow.

1. Sederunt

The meeting commenced at 12.30pm and was attended by:

Andy Woolley (Chair)
Ian Graham (Principal)
Alex Kirk (Depute Principal)
Billy McCallion
Martin Axford
Jimmy Graham
Jim Coleman
Maggie Forsyth
Andrew Macdougall
Sheila Reddix (Marsh)
Anne MacDonald

In Attendance:

Alan Sherry (Assistant Principal)
George Webb (Project Manager, Capita Symonds)
Sharon De Sykes (Capita Symonds)
S Vaughan (minute taker)

2. Apologies

Jim Cope
Fiona McDade

3. Declarations of Interest

A Woolley declared an interest in respect of Item 7 (a) as a result of his role as an employee of Scottish Enterprise Glasgow and item 10 as a result of his membership of the Scottish Further Education Funding Council's 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 11 members in attendance.

5. Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 30 November 2004

The minutes were accepted as an accurate record of the meeting held on the 30 November 2004.

6. Matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting

I Graham reported that he had written to Tim Mitchell (Glasgow City Council, Department of Regeneration Services) thanking him for his presentation on the East End Regeneration Route at the 30 November meeting of the Project Management Group.

Item 8 – Project Status Report No. 1 – November 2004

A Kirk informed all present that BRB (Residuals) Ltd had informed him that the land triangle adjacent to the site of the new campus, which the College has expressed an interest in purchasing, has not been on the market before and in these circumstances BRB (Residuals) Ltd are required to contact the Strategic Rail Authority, in order to request permission to sell the land. He reported that if BRB (Residuals) Ltd is granted permission from the Strategic Rail Authority to sell the land, then the College will liaise directly with the agent acting on behalf of BRB (Residuals) Ltd in order to purchase the land, rather than appoint another company to handle this aspect of the project.

Members should note that the acquisition of this site was not essential to permit the project to proceed.

7. Correspondence

a) Scottish Enterprise Glasgow - Construction Skills Action Plan Proposal (Capital Build)

A Woolley declared an interest in this item in his role as an employee of Scottish Enterprise Glasgow.

A Kirk informed members that Scottish Enterprise Glasgow (SEG) had appointed Robinson Low Francis (Quantity Surveyors) to undertake an appraisal of the College's bid for funding from the Construction Skills Action Plan budget. In response to questions, he confirmed that the College had submitted a bid for circa £750k to support the construction and related elements of the new East End campus.

Members noted the contents of the correspondence.

Anne MacDonald joined the meeting at this point.

b) Marsh Ltd -Owner Controlled Insurance Programmes

A Kirk informed members that the College would utilise Owner Controlled Insurance Programmes for its insurance cover for the new build project, as this would provide the most comprehensive protection over the

duration of the construction phase. He further informed members that this information would be included in the pack which would be provided to potential contractors responding to the first stage of the tender process.

He assured members that the costs of the cover would be recouped from the contractors. Members noted the contents of the correspondence.

8. Outline Planning Permission- Proposed New College Campus, Haghill Road

A Kirk spoke to the correspondence, which included a copy of the Outline Planning Approval for the site at Haghill Road/Carntyne Road which had been obtained from Glasgow City Council . A Kirk informed members that the Outline Planning Permission clarified the conditions which the College would require to meet as part of the planning consent. In response to questions, he reported that the College was confident that it could meet all of the conditions that were outlined in the documentation.

A Kirk drew members' attention to condition 13, which stated that all surface water from the site should be treated in accordance with the principles of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems in the interests of flood prevention, informing members that this type of system was included in the detailed plans. He also asked members to note condition 14, which stated that prior to the start of development on site details of (a) surface water drainage including attenuation and sustainable urban drainage systems and (b) a flood risk assessment, shall be submitted for the written approval of the Planning Authority. Thereafter the aforementioned details shall be implemented as approved in the interests of flood prevention and to comply with City Plan Policies. A Kirk reported that the College had already ensured that both conditions 13 and 14 had been fully met.

A Kirk stated that the College's full planning application had been submitted on 15 December 2004 and that it was anticipated that the decision on this application would be known in late January/early February 2005.

Having heard the Depute Principal, members noted the contents of the correspondence.

9. Minutes Design Progress Meeting held on 1 December 2004

A Kirk asked members to note that this meeting was held prior to the submission of the full planning application on 15 December 2004.

I Graham informed members that it was anticipated that the College would apply for funding in 2005 to light the new campus, under Glasgow City Council's "City of Light" initiative.

Members noted the contents of the minutes.

10. Project Status Report No. 2 – January 2005

A Woolley declared an interest in this item, as a result of his membership of the SFEFC Property and Capital Investment Committee.

G Webb highlighted the contents of the Executive Summary section of his report, informing members that the Design Team had held a meeting on 19 January 2005 to further explore the cost plan and confirm the final details of the design. He reported that it was anticipated that by Friday 21 January 2005 the contents of the Stage "D" report should be completed and that the full report should be available by 26 January 2005 and this would form part of the document provided to the Scottish Further Education Funding Council (SFEFC) as part of the Gateway 3 documentation.

I Graham informed members that a draft Gateway 3 report would be submitted to SFEFC in the week commencing 24 January. He further informed members that this report would include the justification for additional capital funding from SFEFC, primarily for the purpose of purchasing the additional land triangle owned by BRB (Residuals) Ltd at Todd Street. The report would also make the case for additional capital to fund the unanticipated cost of connecting the new campus to the Clydenet ICT network. He reminded members that this network gave the College access to high speed broadband connectivity. In response to questions, the Principal reported that it was anticipated that circa £150k would be required for this additional cost. He also intimated that the College would seek additional funds for aspects of the building's sustainable infra-structure. The Principal also informed members that the draft stage 3 report will be considered by the Executive Committee prior to its submission to SFEFC and at a subsequent Board meeting.

G Webb asked members to note that there were some minor errors in the Executive Summary. Firstly, the planning application was submitted on 15 December 2004 and not 16 December 2004, as stated in the summary and secondly, the Site Investigation (SI) report tender application was in circulation. Capita Symonds expects to authorise further SIs for the new building in due course. In response to questions, he reported that this further SI was intended to confirm the previous survey findings, rather than as a result of concerns with regard to the site.

A Kirk informed members that since the progress report had been compiled, the shortlist of contractors outlined on page 3 of the report had altered, as Balfour Beatty had declined the invitation to submit a tender because of other work commitments. He added that as a result of this withdrawal one further contractor (Henry Boot) has been added to the shortlist. A Kirk reminded members that the deadline for the submission of first stage tenders was 14 February 2005 and that it was anticipated that the interviews of prospective contractors would be held during the week commencing 21 February 2005. G Webb informed members that Capita Symonds will provide an update report on the appointment of a contractor in due course.

The Principal informed members that the SFEFC Property and Capital Investment Committee was scheduled to meet early in February 2005 and the College's Gateway 3 report would be considered at that meeting. A Woolley reminded members of his potential conflict of interest, therefore he would consequently absent himself from discussions when the College's case was being considered by the Funding Council Committee.

G Webb reported that the first risk assessment meeting would be held on 2 February 2005. I Graham requested that the Risk Register be added as a standing item to the agenda of future meetings of the Project Management Group. This would enable members to consider the management of the risks associated with the project on an on-going basis. A Sherry agreed to ensure that future agendas contained such an item. In response to questions G Webb reported that the Design team would use the College's Full Business Case as starting point for the risk register.

The Project Manager informed members that Buro Happold was investigating a number of sustainable development technologies, including the biomass boiler, photovoltaic cells, wind turbines and air sourced heat generators. The Principal informed members that while full life costings were available for the majority of these technologies, this was not yet the case for air-sourced heat pumps. He informed members that this technology was in the final stages of the due diligence assessment for the Scottish Executive and that this information would be available prior to the College committing to the installation of this form of heating.

I Graham informed members that the College anticipated that grant assistance would be forthcoming from a variety of sources, to support the installation of sustainable energy technologies.

The Principal reported that Lauder College proposed to build a sustainable development building and that SFEFC had requested that both colleges should share information on their approaches. He informed members that he would seek to do so at an appropriate juncture.

Members noted the contents of the report.

11. Project Financial Report No. 2 – January 2005

A Kirk informed members that this report was intended to provide an update on the proposed funding package. He reported that the College was anticipating that Scottish Enterprise Glasgow would provide £750,000 in funding for the new build project and that the East End Social Inclusion Partnership would provide £500,000. When this funding was confirmed, the College would have sufficient funds for the project, as detailed in the Full Business Case.

He reminded members that additional funding was required in order to support the purchase of the triangle of land owned by BRB (Residuals) Ltd and the ICT infrastructure, as considered previously in item 10.

A Kirk further stated that 3 offers for the Shettleston Campus had been received and these were currently being considered by the College's legal advisors Anderson Fyfe.

Having heard the Depute Principal, members noted the contents of the report and its appendix.

12. Draft Procurement Strategy

A Kirk informed members that the College proposed to use a two-stage tender process, as this reduced the risk which was placed on the College. In addition the contractor would be involved earlier in the design process and would be able to purchase work packages in advance.

In response to questions, G Webb reported that this form of contract offered greater opportunities for value engineering over the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) model used with the Easterhouse campus. Under this form of contract, any savings achieved by the contractor would be equally shared with the College, unlike the GMP model where an agreed target figure had to be met before the College received a share of any savings. This form of contract in effect meant that the target price became the GMP. He informed members that Capita Symonds was using this form of contract on a number of projects and that Doig and Smith (the College's Quality Surveyors) had also used this approach successfully in the past. He further informed members that the advantage of this form of contract was that the project was viewed in its entirety, taking into account factors such as design costs, therefore any changes could be identified early and resolved within a pre-determined period and within the budget.

A Kirk reported that the College's legal advisors had considered a copy of the Draft Procurement Strategy (including the proposed contractual arrangements) and had endorsed the approach.

In response to questions, A Kirk reported that the November 2004 budget for the new campus remained with £6.9 million available for the building. He informed members that Doig and Smith had worked with the Design team in order to produce a cost plan which delivered the building which the Board required within this resource envelope. He further reported that circa £500k had been set aside for the purchase of equipment and furniture within this budget.

The Principal informed members that it was anticipated that the SFEFC formulaic allocations of capital grant would continue for the foreseeable future and that the College intended to use this grant to support elements of the new building (in financial years 2004/05, 2005/06, and 2006/07).

Having heard the Depute Principal, members noted the contents of the report and its appendix.

Sharon De Sykes joined the meeting at 1.20 pm.

13. Latest Design Drawings

A Kirk circulated both large-scale colour plans and A4 colour sketches of the new building to members. He informed members that the key principles which underpinned the design concept had been retained, with only minor changes required in order to ensure that the building remained within the resource envelope.

In response to questions, he reported that it was anticipated that the contract would probably commence on 1 April 2005, with work on the site commencing in May 2005 and the College using the building from August 2006.

The Principal informed members that the College would take steps to ensure that a condition of sale would be that the Shettleston campus did not require to be vacated until mid December 2006, thus allowing lee-way for possible construction delays if this was required.

In response to questions, the Depute Principal reported that Buro Happold would be responsible for the secondary steel work, but would not be responsible for the building's flexible roof and that this responsibility would lie with the specialist contractor who would provide the roof. He further reported that both external and internal CCTV systems were included in the specification.

A Kirk also informed members that staff had been issued room data sheets, which contained details of the proposed contents, as part of the consultation process. He reported that staff focus groups would be held with the architects in early March 2005 to further explore this aspect of the design.

Members noted the latest design drawings for the new building and the verbal reports provided by the College and its consultants.

14. Scottish Further Education Funding Council (SFEFC) Report Format Proforma

A Kirk informed members that the SFEFC had produced a revised report format which differed considerably from the previous version. He further informed members that the College would use this documentation when making its regular progress reports to SFEFC.

Members noted the contents of the SFEFC report format pro forma.

15. East End Campus – Travel Plan

A Kirk informed members that the report contained the College's Travel Plan which had been submitted as part of the full planning application. It detailed how the College anticipated both learner and staff use of public transport to the new campus, including the national cycle route. It also outlined the steps which the College would take to encourage the use of public transport for both learners and staff.

The Depute Principal informed members he proposed to take this version of the plan for formal endorsement to the next scheduled meeting of the Board of Management.

Members agreed to:

- i) note the contents of the Principal's report;
- ii) note the contents of the College's Travel Plan for the East End Campus building at Haghill;

- iii) endorse the Travel Plan; and
- iv) request the College to forward the Travel Plan to ABK Architects for inclusion in the Planning Application for the East End Campus.

16. Date of next meeting

Following discussion, it was agreed to reschedule the meeting to Wednesday 9 March 2005, at the earlier time of 12.00 pm. A Sherry agreed to inform all of the members of the Project Management Group who were not present of the date of the next meeting.

17. Closure

The meeting closed at 2.50 pm with the Chair thanking all members for their contribution to the meeting.