

GOLDSMITHS
University of London
COUNCIL
ESTATES COMMITTEE
8 March 2011

Minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2011

- Present:** Mr James Grierson (in the Chair), Mr Michael Dick, Mr Hugh Jones, Dr Richard Noble, Ms Bindz Patel, Professor Alan Pickering.
- In attendance:** Director of Finance, Head of Capital Projects, Head of Residences, Catering and Conference Services, Chief Executive of the Students' Union, Director of Development and Alumni Office, Head of Administration, Estates & Facilities (Secretary).
- Apologies:** Ms Mary Stacey, Mr Richard Groves, Mr Nick Jones

OPEN BUSINESS

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2 MINUTES

Minute 2 (9 February 2011) refers)

that the Minutes of the meeting held on 26 October 2010 be discussed at the 8 March 2011 meeting;

Resolved:

- (i) that the minutes of the meeting held 26 October 2011 be approved subject to the following amendment;
- (ii) Item 10, (ii), should read, The Committee expressed general dissatisfaction at the slowness of negotiations with Trades Unions. One member re-iterated previous comments that had previously and continued to be widely expressed by the Committee, which was, the present arrangements for holiday pay of porters, enhanced by overtime, were unreasonable, and unfair to other categories of staff who did not benefit. It was noted however that this was a longstanding arrangement and not central to the issues currently under discussion.

Resolved:

- (i) that the minutes of the meeting held 9 February 2011 be approved subject the following additional minutes;

- (ii) item 4, that to enable the teaching room improvement projects to be carried out, budgets should be front loaded into the first budget year 2011 – 2012;
- (iii) item 4, the Draft Project Management Methodology Manual, the Committee expressed their view that whilst implementing new processes for project bids, consideration should be given to avoid making cumbersome and unwieldy processes that will be time consuming and inefficient.

3 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Director of Estates and Facilities provided an update on the partnership options for student residences. It was noted that talks were already being held with providers to consider a range of financial models.

Noted:

that there was a need to tie together initiatives derived from the College Strategy as this would inform the future accommodation needs of the College.

Resolved:

that a further progress report would be given when the process had developed further.

4 CAPITAL PROJECTS: PLANNING FOR FUTURE INVESTMENT

Received:

an oral report on the progress of Capital Programme Bids for 2010 – 2014.

The Committee noted that the Capital Programme Project bids 2010-2014 would be discussed at an upcoming meeting of SMT. The Committee re-iterated its view as was previously resolved at the meeting held 9 February 2011, that the Public Realm projects, the refurbishment of the Richard Hoggart Building Forecourt and the pedestrianisation of Laurie Grove were highly viewed by the Committee as projects to be taken forward.

Received:

a capital projects progress report from the Head of Capital Projects (C,11-85).

- (i) that a demonstration of the Stairmate Major had taken place and the College would go ahead with the purchase of the Stairmate Major that would be located in the Deptford Townhall Building and that one of the benefits of purchase was that it offered flexibility in that it could be re-located and operated in other campus buildings;
- (ii) that the work to create the Student Services Centre within the Richard Hoggart Building would go ahead for completion by the start of the new Academic Year together with the refurbishment of a number of teaching rooms and office decanting space.

One member of the Committee sought an update regarding the department's plans for the development of a 'Framework Agreement' for Building Project Consultants. It was noted that

this Framework would be of particular advantage and facilitate the expedition of capital works within the three year capital programme.

Recommended:

- (i) that an outturn figure should be established as soon as possible for the Student Services Centre.

5 FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

Received:

the review of the soft services consultation report from the Head of Facilities and an oral update on the progress of the soft services review from the Director of Estates and Facilities (D, 11-86).

The Committee noted the report and commented that it was important to keep the momentum to expedite a conclusion.

6 SPACE MANAGEMENT TASK GROUP

Received:

the final report from the Space Management Task Force – Space Usage (E, 11-87).

The Committee welcomed the report from the Space Management Task Group and wished to convey its thanks to the group for the work that had been carried out. The Committee also wished to convey that the paper presented a number very good solutions to intractable problems. The Director of Estates and Facilities provided the Committee with an overview of the work that had been carried out by the group.

The Committee reviewed the recommendations presented in the report and commented as follows:

In response to recommendation A – Enhancing the Student’s Experience, Quick Wins

- (i) that the Committee supported this as a quick win option that would enhance the look of the campus and that building light projections would be feasible with planning permission and consideration would need to be given to how this would impact on the College’s carbon management strategy together with the additional energy costs that maybe incurred;
- (ii) that the Students’ Union had started reviewing its use of space in terms of how social spaces could be created and or enhanced;

In response to recommendation B - Transforming the use of space: management and strategy

- (iii) that the existing method of receiving, resolving and approving space needs were appropriate. Estates were seen as the custodian of space requests and these requests were reported to SMT and the Registrar and Secretary. SMT considered and approved space allocations that accommodated strategic space needs;

- (iv) that room allocations that were regarded as one off or were comparatively minor requests were managed by the Estates and Facilities Department;

In response to recommendation C - Encouraging the more efficient use of existing space

- (v) that a spot survey had revealed that a number of rooms were not being used that had been allocated booked time slots. It was relevant to Surrey House in particular which was under utilized in terms of the available bookable hours;
- (vi) that the room booking system could be reconfigured to allow rooms to be booked earlier e.g. from 9.00am. If rooms are booked earlier more space available;
- (vii) that there were other space allocation constraints associated with the booking of rooms before 9.00am, these related primarily to staff teaching time preferences, which could be linked in some cases, to personal commitments which constrained earlier room booking being allocated, however, that it should also be noted that were this to be implemented, a reasonable lead in time should be put in place to ensure departments are on notice of the change;
- (viii) that space needs should be less driven by staff requirements and driven by student requirements and that a cultural change was viewed as important factor for improving the use of space campus wide;
- (ix) that there was a need to be more smart about how space was used, for example, the use of empty spaces whilst staff were on sabbaticals, consideration should be given to making these spaces available on the room booking system and could offer meeting room options;
- (x) that giving departments access to the room booking system would enhance the room bookings process and it was noted that this was seen as the next stage of the room booking systems development;
- (xi) that Department's were already being charged according to their functional use of space, the Committee suggested that Space Charging could be weighted by the functional use of the space and 5% was viewed as a modest objective for the release of space at departmental level;
- (xii) that unless more money was received by the College there was less money to offer departments for incentives;
- (xiii) that some departments held large dedicated teaching spaces and it was viewed that these should be added to the room booking system;
- (xiv) that an initial assessment has found that rooms 110 and 109 as core meeting room spaces could not be easily re-provided else where on campus as these offered large meeting room facilities;
- (xv) that alongside teaching room improvements an important factor was ensuring that adequate IT provisions were available;
- (xvi) that accommodation with regard to the establishment of a property disposals programme, it should be noted that space was at a premium in New Cross and rents were soaring because of the overground train stations and New Cross being in zone 2.

The Committee also questioned whether art studio spaces could be usefully re-used.

Resolved:

- (i) that following the proposed room audit exercise in the autumn term 2011-12 a review be carried out to establish the cost of space that is booked through central timetabling and subsequently not used.

Recommended:

- (ii) that SMT remain the approving body for space allocations that accommodated strategic space needs.

7 ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY SUB-COMMITTEE**Received:**

- (i) an updating report from the Energy and Environmental Manager (F, 11-88)
- (ii) the Draft Temperature Policy (G, 11-89)

Noted:

The Committee noted the updating energy and environmental report

Resolved:

- (i) that the Draft Temperature Policy be approved by the Estates Committee

8 GENDER NEUTRAL TOILETS**Received:**

a oral report from the Students' Union President in relation to Gender Neutral Toilets.

The Committee were invited to note that the paper had been submitted to the meeting of the Equality and Diversity Sub-Committee, February 2011 and the proposals presented in the paper were supported in principle (H, 11-27).

Noted:

- (i) that this would present the opportunity to create gender neutral toilets in the Richard Hoggart Building, and other areas identified were the toilet music wing corridor.

Resolved:

- (i) that the College moves towards building more gender-neutral toilet facilities across the College as a priority, particularly on the ground floor of the Richard Hoggart Building;
- (ii) that any new toilets or refurbishments of toilets consider options for gender-neutral toilet provision;
- (iii) that the College adopts the signage used in the New Academic Building toilets as a suitable example of a gender neutral toilet sign.

9 AOB

The Director of Estates and Facilities reported that the College had received notification from HEFCE, regarding CIF2 requirements. The College had met the CIF2 requirements and would be allocated Capital Investment Funds that would primarily contribute to the cost of capital projects to be carried out within the 2010-11 budget year.

The Committee noted that the naming rights for the New Academic Building was being progressed.

Resolved

- (i) that companies should be approached before the start of the works to the Richard Hoggart Building Foyer to establish whether there would be interest from a funding point of view;
- (ii) that the Director for Development and Alumni would attend future meetings of the Committee in an attendance capacity and was invited to advise the Committee of matters in the Development Office Agenda that would be relevant to discuss at the Committee.

10 FUTURE MEETINGS

To note that meetings of the Estates Committee in 2010-11 will be held at the following dates and times in Room 110, Deptford Town Hall Building:

Tuesday, 17 May 2011, at 2.30pm [**Secretary's note:** this meeting was subsequently cancelled]

Tuesday, 5 July 2011, at 2.30pm