

John Wheatley College

Project Management Group

Minutes of the Project Management Group meeting held on Tuesday 30 November 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)
Alex Kirk (Depute Principal)
Billy McCallion
Jimmy Graham
Andrew Macdougall
Ian Graham (Principal)
Shelia Reddux (Marsh)

Also in attendance:

Alan Sherry (Assistant Principal)
George Webb (Project Manager, Capita Symonds)
Tim Mitchell (Glasgow City Council, Department of Regeneration Services)
S Vaughan (minute taker)

2. Apologies

Jim Coleman
Anne McDonald
Fiona McDade
Jim Cope

3. Declarations of Interest

A Woolley declared an interest in respect of Item 8, as a result of his membership of the SFEFC 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 5 members in attendance.

5. Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 26 October 2004

It was requested that Alex Kirk should be removed from the 'Also in attendance' section of item 1 of the minutes to the 'Sederunt' section, since he is a member of

the Project Management Group. Pending this alteration, the minutes were accepted as an accurate record of the meeting held on the 26 October 2004.

6. Matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting

There were no matters arising from the meeting held on 26 October 2004.

7. Correspondence

a) Visit to Devonshire building letter to Claire Rogers – Newcastle University

Members noted the contents of the correspondence.

b) Visit to Devonshire building letter Geraldine Johnston - SFEFC

Members noted the contents of the correspondence.

The chair proposed that the agenda should be altered to allow T Mitchell (Glasgow City Council, Department of Regeneration Services) to make a short presentation on the East End Regeneration Route. Members agreed to this proposal.

T Mitchell distributed to a copy of the 'East End Regeneration Route Environmental Statement – Non Technical Summary' which was produced by Glasgow City Council and he summarised the contents of the document. He informed members that he has detailed drawings of the site, which he would provide on request.

He then spoke to the report, highlighting that it was anticipated that by 2008 the M74 motorway will be extended between its existing termination at Fullarton Road, near Cambuslang and the M8 motorway, west of the Kingston Bridge. This will aid the regeneration of southeast Glasgow and Glasgow City Council proposes to further improve the regeneration of this area of the City by creating an East End Regeneration Route (EERR). The EERR will link to the Polmadie Junction on the completed M74 and will link to the Provan Junction on the M8/M80 motorways, giving improved accessibility between the strategic road network and the East End of Glasgow. The budget for the project is approximately £42 million. One additional year has been incorporated into the construction programme for the EERR, in order to allow additional time in the event that it was deemed that a public enquiry would be necessary. The north and south sections of the site will meet at Biggar Street. At this point, T Mitchell cautioned members that although funding has been secured for the southern part of the EERR, further support is required in order to develop the north end of the route and therefore no information is available yet regarding when this section of the site will be built. However he anticipated that such funding would be made available, as this section of the EERR was crucial in providing development opportunities for some of the most deprived areas of the East End.

Glasgow City Council proposes to build a viaduct at the north end of Biggar Street (as shown in diagram 3 on the inside cover of the 'East End Regeneration Route Environmental Statement – Non Technical Summary') and it estimates

that the cost will be £7.5 million. T Mitchell informed members that the Council proposed to utilise the space under the viaduct, thus obviating the need for the current link between Duke Street and Carntyne. The Council has allowed space under the viaduct for the building of a light railway. If built, the light railway would enable easy access to the College's Easterhouse Campus, as both buildings would be linked by this new transport route. He further reported that Strathclyde Passenger Transport Executive (SPTX) proposed to build a new railway station at Parkhead, adjacent to the location of the new campus, and is currently commissioning consultants to develop this proposal. As the proposed new campus is located adjacent to the current bus routes, this would reduce the need for learners and staff to travel by car.

T Mitchell further informed members that it was likely that Todd Street would be closed at both ends to vehicular traffic following completion of the EERR. He reported that the area under the new viaduct and on the west side of the site will be landscaped. In response to questions, he confirmed that the Suds attenuation pond which is located on the viaduct site could be used by the College and other relevant parties. Regardless of this, the pond would be essential in order to prevent flooding in the East End.

T Mitchell stated that Junction 9 will not be traffic light controlled. Regarding the noise levels that will be experienced by the site of the new College building, the east end of the site should experience the highest noise levels - however these will be well within acceptable limits. The teaching block will not be subject to excessive noise levels, partly because the maximum traffic speed permissible on the section of road bordering this area of the site will be 40 mph and partly because of the height of the viaduct. He confirmed that between approximately 300 and 400 houses will be built next to the College at the Haghill end of the site.

He outlined the Council's likely approach to landscaping the areas adjacent to the Regeneration Route. He indicated that there was scope for integration of this element of the project with areas surrounding the College's new Campus. This could, if funds permitted, enable a planting strategy which related to new statutory duties related to biodiversity.

There being no further questions the Chair thanked T Mitchell for his informative presentation.

8. Project Status Report No 1 – November 2004

A Woolley reminded members that he had declared an interest in respect of this item, in view of his membership of the SFEFC Property and Capital Investment Committee.

G Webb stated that currently the College is marginally ahead of its schedule with regards to the agreed timeline for the project and that a monthly report on the status of the project would now be provided by Capita Symonds as work progressed. He informed members that the tender exercise for building contractors had now commenced and that the Principal, Depute Principal and Project Manager would identify a shortlist who would be requested to make a presentation to a selection committee in early January 2005. He informed members that a meeting had been scheduled for 1 December 2004, at which it is

expected that the final design plan for the building will be presented by ABK. He further reported that the design was now buildable within the budget allocated to the project. The Project Manager confirmed that further value engineering was being undertaken by Doig and Smith (the College's Quantity Surveyors) in association with both Buro Happold and ABK. In response to questions, he confirmed that the concourse had been retained, as had the key features of the external design. G Webb informed members that the College had now obtained authority from Halcro to issue the Site Investigation reports to Buro Happold. Issues that have yet to be resolved include further investigation of the limited mine workings which were identified on the site by Halcro and also the shoring up the South-West Carntyne end of the site to level the surface. However, he reported that neither of these issues had been identified as requiring substantial changes to the proposed building. The Principal reported that the site report confirmed that some complex hydrocarbons had been detected on some areas of the site, however this could be dealt with by engineering solutions.

He further indicated that the costs of dealing with these issues would be reflected in an adjustment of the site's purchase price.

G Webb informed members that he had received the draft procurement strategy on 30 November 2004 and will circulate this document to the Project Management Group. G Webb requested that the strategy be appended to the minutes of this meeting (Appendix 1). A Sherry agreed to do this.

He further informed members that a full planning application will be submitted to Glasgow City Council by 17 December 2004. The College has not yet received Outline Planning Consent for the site, though there are no indications that the proposal will be rejected. It is anticipated that subject to planning approval, building work will commence in April 2005, with the building being operational from August 2006.

A Kirk reported that it would not be possible for the main contract to be signed on behalf of the College until 1 March 2005 (approximately) to comply with tender procedures and the confirmation of grant support from Strathclyde European Partnership.

A Kirk informed members that he had been in contact with BRB (Residuals) Ltd with a view to purchasing the area of land which abutted the proposed site. He reported that initial indications were that BRB (Residuals) Ltd was actively considering the offer and in addition had also offered the College additional land - specifically the railway cutting which borders the site. A Kirk reported that he had written to BRB (Residuals) Ltd's agent to clarify this offer and to Keith Pender (Department of Regeneration Services, Glasgow City Council) to ascertain how best this additional land could be used to the benefit of the College and the City Council. A Kirk circulated 3 maps which indicated the additional land and its position in relation to the proposed new campus and other developments within the area.

The purchase of this additional land would, he opined, yield potential benefits to the College. It could improve student external recreational areas, decrease the density of car parking and allow a more sympathetic planting strategy to be adopted.

A Kirk informed members that a Draft Travel Plan had been considered at a meeting of the College's Sustainable Development Committee and an amended version of that document (which reflected discussions there) would be forwarded to Glasgow City Council in due course as part of the planning application process.

A Kirk informed members that the College intends to investigate the possibility of obtaining additional funding in order to make some further 'green' additions to the proposed campus, for example the addition of windmills to generate power to drive air source heat pumps and that it is currently liaising with Buro Happold to determine what may be practicable and affordable.

9. Technical Assessment Report for European Structural Funds Application

Members noted the contents of the report. It was noted that the version of the report under consideration was not the most recent version, the report having been modified slightly. A Kirk confirmed that he had made contact with SEP and would provide them with the additional information that they required. In response to questions he reported that the College had submitted the bulk of the information requested with its original application and had informed SEP of this.

10. Summary Project Financial Information

Members noted the contents of the report. I Graham informed members that the SFEFC had formally written to offer the College a grant of £5.8 million towards the cost of the project - however a number of conditions were attached to the offer, which required clarification before the Board could accept this offer of funding. He informed members that he had written to SFEFC seeking such clarification but as yet had not received a response.

11. Date of next meeting

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as 20 January 2005 at 12.30 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.

12. Closure

The meeting closed at 2 pm with the Chair thanking all members for their contribution to the meeting.