

**Goldsmiths  
University of London**

**COUNCIL**

**ESTATES COMMITTEE**

9 February 2010

**Present:** James Grierson (Chair), Hugh Jones, Michael Dick, Mary Stacey, Nick Jones, Sally Townsend, Catriona Boulton, Alan Pickering, Graham Gaskell

**In Attendance:** Mary Bright, Richard Groves, Sarah Cloherty (note taker)

**Apologies:** Richard Grayson, Patsy Carter, Terry Rosenberg, Rheem Al-Adhami

**OPEN BUSINESS**

**1 WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS**

Noted:

- (i) Richard Groves

**2 IDENTIFICATION OF ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

Noted:

- (i) that no items were identified as needing substantive discussion.

**3 MINUTES**

Noted:

- (i) that item 11, note 9 should be amended by deleting the wording 'regardless of the Unions';
- (ii) that item 11, note 12 should be amended to read that 'an email has been sent to building users outlining the measures for future portering arrangements';
- (iii) that Catriona Boulton was present at the last meeting.

**Resolved:**

- (i) that the minutes of the last meeting held on 27 October 2009 be approved.

#### **4 MATTERS ARISING**

Noted:

- (i) that the matter relating to departmental representation on larger project boards had been discussed at the last meeting of Council;
- (ii) that Council wants the masterplan to be a non aspirational document i.e. something that was achievable.

**Resolved:**

- (i) that HJ and RG would discuss the above matter of departmental representation further and report back to the next Committee meeting.

#### **5 MASTER PLANNING PROGRAMME**

Received:

an oral update on the progress of the master planning exercise from the Director of Estates and Facilities.

Noted:

- (i) that the Master Planning paper sent to Council was well received and that Council strongly supported the proposed measures;
- (ii) that the College finances would dictate the programme for change;
- (iii) that initial meetings with the Highways Agency to discuss the possibility of 'adopting' Laurie Grove and Dixon Road and turning it into a pedestrian only area had taken place; and the initial works would be the installation of double yellow lines along Dixon Road and Laurie Grove;
- (iv) that having yellow lines along Dixon Road and Laurie Grove was a relatively cheap option and would encourage people to find alternative methods of transport;
- (v) that by implementing the above it would come as far less of a 'shock' to people when Laurie Grove and Dixon Road became pedestrianised and although a good proposal the College should 'hold off' for awhile and try to encourage people to find alternative methods of travel;
- (vi) that the College were currently looking into procurement options for new student accommodation and that both DTZ and King Sturge had been approached to advise on procurement options and submit fee proposals for further work;
- (vii) that a an exhibition on the Masterplan in the Whitehead Building foyer was in place;
- (viii) that a date to present the Masterplan to Lewisham's Planning Department had not yet been fixed;
- (ix) that the approximate total cost of implementing the Masterplan was between £33m and £105m;
- (x) that the masterplan would have to be phased in with projects such as landscaping the front car park, a new development on the St James Annexe site, pedestrianisation of Laurie Grove and Dixon Road being implemented first;

- (xi) that if a growth in the recruitment of international students produced larger surpluses there would be more available to fund projects;
- (xii) that in light of the current projections on income it was more likely that the Masterplan programme would be achievable over a 20 year programme;
- (xiii) that discussions were due to be held with Lewisham Planners in order to gain their response to the proposals contained within the draft the Master Plan;
- (xiv) that the New Cross Road Shop would be kept in reasonable state of repair in preparation for future use;

**Resolved:**

- (i) that Lewisham would be asked to paint double yellow lines on one side of Laurie Grove and Dixon Road in order to ease congestion, improve pedestrian access and to get people used to the idea of these areas becoming fully pedestrianised in the future;
- (ii) that a meeting would be setup with Emma Talbot and others at Lewisham Planning;
- (iii) that the Residences Catering and Conference Services department and the Estates and Facilities department would report on the outcome of meetings King Sturge.

**6 FACILITIES MANAGEMENT**

Received:

Paper 10-29, Proposed Review of Structure – Facilities Soft Services and an oral update from the Head of Facilities

Noted:

- (i) that the problems with Porters hours and workload were outlined in the paper;
- (ii) that overtime had increased as the College was open for longer but that porters hours had been cut down to 35 hours a week;
- (iii) that the responsibilities of the porters and security are at times blurred and this resulted in misunderstandings and a perception of poor service;
- (iv) that the cleaning contract was under managed so a manager role had been included to cover this and the security contract;
- (v) that overtime would still be a requirement in order to cover evening and weekend college events;
- (vi) that any additional events included costs for the overtime of porters;
- (vii) that access to the buildings where static porters are removed will need access and security improvements;
- (viii) that implementing either of these proposals was not based on cost savings for the College but would mean that the service offered would be much improved;

- (ix) that the Committee was of the opinion that money was not the main consideration but that effectiveness and efficiency in order to achieve value for this money was;
- (x) that new Job Descriptions for the Porters were being devised;
- (xi) that currently the vacant portering posts were not being recruited to, due to the likely impact of the access and security review on the structure;
- (xii) that the last meeting (between the College and the Union) to discuss holiday pay had not yet been resolved but this was to be actioned if the soft services review was delayed;
- (xiii) that the review would also consider the need to ensure that reception areas were covered by staff trained in reception duties, that the main concerns of the College in relation to receptions and reception cover was to provide a professional service as this was the first point of contact to the College;
- (xiv) that the adding reception duties to the security contract should be discussed;
- (xv) that the main difference between the two proposals was that proposal one incorporates reception duties;
- (xvi) that a new reception desk would be installed in the RHB and DTH;
- (xvii) that the College should consider the possibility of students covering reception areas a similar arrangement to the SU shop that was being staffed by 3<sup>rd</sup> year students;
- (xviii) that having a pool of student staff may be advantageous to the College in many different areas;
- ((xxi) that discussions over cover for the library were ongoing;
- (xxii) that sickness/absence was problem and that this was currently being managed more closely with HR;
- (xxiii) that a Contract Management post within the new facilities management structure was a good proposal.

**Resolved:**

- (i) that proposal one be put forward to SMT for approval

## **7 ESTATES MAINTENANCE AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS**

Received:

An oral report from the Head of Administration on the development of the Shire maintenance management system and the Syllabus Plus Room-booking System

Noted:

- (i) that in the absence of the Head of Administration, Michael Dick, Director of Estates and Facilities, gave an oral report;
- (ii) that Shire was currently undergoing a process review and that the two workshops that had been held had been received well;
- (iii) that feedback on outstanding logged works orders was not good and needed to be improved and the status reporting to service users had to be improved;
- (iv) that IT Services were working with Estates and Facilities to improve this and that in future feedback/updates will be sent automatically to customers;
- (v) that it was important RCCS received feedback as they are dealing with their own customers and lack of communication could sometimes escalate a relatively minor problem into a larger problem;
- (vi) that prioritising jobs was of great importance and that other departments should understand which jobs are of more importance in the wider context i.e. shelving was far less important than a burst pipe;
- (viii) that the recommendations following the review would be discuss and where practical implemented as soon as possible;
- (ix) that PIRANA, a web based Shire system, could be used now however it was felt it was too early to move over to this system;
- (x) that the timetabling software (Scienta, Syllabus Plus and Enterprise) had now been installed and was up and running;
- (xi) that the departmental administrators had been given the necessary training and were due to input their information into the system;
- (xii) that this information not only included bookable rooms but also included their 'own' spaces;
- (xiii) that the new system would be used in the new academic year 2010/11.

## **8 CAPITAL PROJECTS AND MINOR WORKS**

Received:

A paper (10-30) and an oral report from the Head of Capital Projects

Noted:

- (i) that it was looking increasingly unlikely that the new substation would be ready in time for the commissioning of the building;

- (ii) that Wilmott Dixon (WD) were looking into the use of temporary generators until the substation was up and running but that this would need further discussion as we are currently unsure if this would create problems;
- (iv) that all legal agreements in relation to the new substation had been agreed by all parties and that these would be signed off;
- (v) that trenching works for the new power cables were due to begin;
- (vi) that inclement weather had put WD behind programme however they had implemented a recovery programme and hope to regain the lost time;
- (vii) that a meeting in relation to the Library chillers and the discharge of conditions was due to take place; and that the cost for these works was likely to go a little over budget;
- (ix) that the Surrey House refurbishment was proving to be very problematic with more and more issues surfacing as works progressed and the main drainage tunnelling had been completed however there was more work required;
- (xi) that inclement weather had affected the external repairs programme and that this had had a knock on effect in relation to the budget;
- (xii) that the dry rot works had now been completed and that the closing up of these areas should be complete by the start of teaching in April;
- (xiii) that the party wall (no. 82) was a cause for concern as structural engineers had informed the College that this wall was dangerous and correspondence had been sent to both the freeholders and lease holders in relation to this wall but as yet the College had received no response;
- (xvi) that the party wall works were separate from the main Surrey House project;
- (xvii) that consultants for the LGB project had been appointed and would include the conversion of the water tank into an art gallery and that this idea had been well received by the art department;
- (xix) that the project was visually exciting so lends itself to possible external fundraising opportunities;
- (xx) that an application for listed building consent would need to be filed with Lewisham as soon as possible;

## **9 SIGNAGE AND WAYFINDING PROJECT**

Received:

a campus orientation map and an oral report from the Head of Administration, Estates and Facilities

Noted:

- (i) that in the absences of the Head of Administration the update would be given by the Director of Estates and Facilities;
- (ii) that planning applications had been granted by Lewisham and the installation of signage on listed buildings (including wayfinding signage) were due to take place in eight weeks;

- (iv) that some people felt that the campus maps 'totems' were too abstract to understand and should highlight where possible access routes around the campus;
- (v) that the New Academic Building would form phase one of the internal signage project and that the College were now looking into procuring a reasonably priced 'off the shelf' system of signage;

It was noted that Hugh Jones had spoken with Network Rail in relation to installing Goldsmiths signage at both New Cross Gate and New Cross Railway Stations, Network Rail were enthusiastic towards the idea however they are in the process of reviewing their signage and suggest that the College wait until their review was completed, the College would need to follow this up with Network Rail after their review had taken place.

## **11 ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY SUB-COMMITTEE**

Received:

- (i) An oral report from the Director of Estates and Facilities following the Environment and Sustainability Sub-Committee meeting held 14 January 2010;
- (ii) the draft Waste Management Strategy, paper 10-1R, and an oral report from the Energy and Environmental Manager.

Noted:

- (i) that the biodiversity strategy had been redrafted after consultation with Lewisham and the Wildlife Trust;
- (ii) that the Wildlife Trust, who hold the licence for the railway cutting site, were very enthusiastic for Goldsmiths to become involved in the use of this site;
- (iii) that a thermal imaging camera survey had taken place and that the pictures generated from this survey were handed to Committee members to look at;
- (iv) that the Energy and Environmental Manager (EEM) was looking to tackle various 'problem' areas around campus;
- (v) that so far not all radiators within the College had thermostatic radiator valves and that this would be addressed in due course;
- (vi) that the EEM would try and read all meters in halls of residence and then would try and come up with a way of billing students for the energy they use;
- (vii) that the lights that are constantly on in the BPB was an intrinsic fault and that this fault had now been fixed;
- (viii) that the EEM had been making staff/students in the BPB more aware of the fact that they leave lights on when they are not needed and that this had had a positive impact with more and more lights being switched off when people leave rooms/areas;
- (ix) that the EEM was looking into the installation of solar panels on the roof of the BPB and that this could cost approximately £50k however pay back would be achieved after 5 years;
- (x) that our skip waste currently gets collected by our main waste contractors and that this then goes to Lewisham landfill sites;
- (xi) that the College should take more advantage of the fact that Lewisham reuse all recycling

- (xii) that the EEM hopes that the amount of waste going to landfill will be reduced to 50% by 2012 or hopefully even sooner;
- (xiii) that the current arrangement for paper recycling was not user friendly and that paper contamination was prevalent;
- (xiv) that the EEM had spoken with Lewisham and that Lewisham had agreed to supply green recycling bins to all properties in Laurie Grove and Dixon Road;
- (xv) that once these bins had been delivered by Lewisham the EEM would ensure that individuals bins within these properties were removed and replaced with one central bin for no recyclable items and that all other recyclable items could easily be disposed of in the green wheelie bins;
- (xvi) that the EEM and Sarah Gibbon were working towards reducing the number of toner cartridges being used College wide and that they were looking at suppliers who would collect the old cartridges along with packaging when delivering new;
- (xvii) that IT services and the EEM were looking into a similar supplier for computers etc.

## **10 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Noted:

- (i) that the cleaning contract had been under managed; and was under performing and that meetings were being held with the contractor in a bid to resolve the performance issues:
- (v) that if required there are two current new suppliers and that the LUPC framework would be the quickest route to bring one of them on board.
- (vi) that there was a 6 month notice period written into the current contract

## **11 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Noted:

- (i) that the next meeting of the Estates Committee would take place on 18 May at 2pm in DTH110