

# Chichester College

## Minutes of the Meeting of the Buildings & Estates Committee held on Wednesday 10 December 2008

### Present:

Mr Patrick Green (Chairman)  
Mrs Angie Hobson (Vice Chairman)

Mr David Hett	Mr Nick O'Brien
Mr John Goble	Dr Richard Parker
Mr David Hazeldon	Miss Frances Russell

### In Attendance:

Mr David Smith, Clerk to the Governing Body  
Mr John Bates, Deputy Principal  
Ms Ida Hess, Hawkins\Brown  
Mrs Shelagh Legrave, Chief Financial Officer  
Mr Tim Rushforth, AAYH  
Ms Sarah Stannard, Vice Principal (Marketing and Business Development)  
Mr Chris Tremellen, Davis Langdon  
Miss Catherine Vinall, Senior Administrator

### **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

56. An apology for absence was received from Robin Macmillan.

### **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

57. The Chairman drew the attention of the Governors and those in attendance at the meeting to the requirement to declare any interests they might have in any of the items on the agenda, as detailed in the agenda sheet.

### **MINUTES**

58. Subject to the inclusion of David Hett amongst the list of attendees, the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 4 November 2008 were taken as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

## CAPITAL PROJECT UPDATE

### a) LSC Phasing Requirements

59. The Committee received for consideration a report by the Vice-Principal (Corporate Services) on the impact of the requirement introduced by the LSC that all large capital projects should be broken into phases.

(Copy attached at APPENDIX 1 to the Minute Book copy)

60. David Smith reported on the meeting with LSC officials that had led to the requirement. Although it had not been given as the reason there was a suspicion that the LSC was in danger of over-committing itself against the capital allocation it received from the Government and was taking action to spread costs over a longer period. Chris Tremellen stated that the Regional Property Adviser (RPA) had indicated that she still intended to present the AiP as a single proposal with the phased option as the fall-back position. Shelagh Legrave stated that she remained concerned at the financial exposure of the Corporation from the costs it was incurring developing the project. This would remain until the AiP was approved. The RPA had indicated that the AiP would be presented to the Regional Committee on 12 January 2009, with a fall back date of 29 January 2009.
61. On the assumption that phasing would be required, Patrick Green suggested that the main issue the Committee needed to consider was whether to continue to develop the AiD for the whole scheme or simply to focus on developing the AiD for Phase One. In response to a question from Angie Hobson, Richard suggested that there was no evidence that Phase Two would not be approved. In his view the question was more one of timing. In response to a question from Patrick, Shelagh suggested that while she did not have details of the relative costs of the two options she believed it would be in the College's best interests to continue to develop the whole scheme. After further discussion it was

#### Resolved to Recommend:

That despite the requirement of the LSC to split the capital project into phases the professional team should continue to develop the full scheme.

### b) Monthly Report

62. The Committee received for information the monthly report from the Project Manager.

(Copy attached at APPENDIX 2 to the Minute Book copy)

63. Tim Rushforth report that the Stage D proposals for the Brinsbury Campus had been completed and having been discussed with the College, were ready for sign-off and submission to planning. Tim stated that the various surveys that had been commissioned had virtually been completed. Going forward they were looking at the appointment of the M & E contractors for each of the campuses. David Smith reported that a further meeting had been held with the planning officers from Chichester District Council. Subject to further discussions about the location and size of the energy centre they were generally happy with the proposals and did not foresee any problems when they were submitted for planning approval.
64. Chris Tremellen referred to the meeting with the RPA and her suggestion that the College would have to phase its proposals if it wished to secure approval. Chris suggested that if more notice of this requirement had been given it might have been possible to come up with a better plan. Having been put on the spot the response had been pragmatic but with further analysis there were structural questions about the construction of the new C-Block without the adjoining elements of the workshop block. Having said this he suggested that once the AiP was approved it would be possible to put forward alternative proposals provided they remained within the approved budget. In response to a question from John Goble, Chris stated that the costs of the Brinsbury Campus proposals were still approximately three per cent above the base line costs of £32m provided in the AiP. He also stated that the Phase 1 cost for the Chichester Campus were of the order of £43m. Chris suggested that with continuing changes in market costs it was not necessary at this stage to consider taking drastic action to reduce costs at the Brinsbury Campus. This issue could be addressed as the AiD was developed.
- c) Stage D Sign-Off Arrangements
- i) Brinsbury Campus
65. In the light of the previous discussion and on the recommendation of the Executive Team, having reviewed the detailed proposals of the Project Team, it was

**Resolved to Recommend:**

***That the Chairman of the Governing Body together with the Chairman of the Building & Estates Committee be authorised to sign off the Stage D proposals for the Brinsbury Campus and their submission to Horsham District Council for planning clearance***

ii) Chichester Campus

66. Richard Parker reported that the Executive Team would be meeting with the Project Team on 15 December to review the Stage D proposals for the Chichester Campus. He suggested that there were no known issues of significance which might impinge on the proposals. If the Committee was happy to accept this and that any unforeseen issues would be reported to the Chairmen, he asked that they be granted permission to sign off the Chichester Campus proposals to enable planning clearance to be sought. After a brief discussion it was

**Resolved to Recommend:**

*That the Chairman of the Governing Body together with the Chairman of the Building & Estates Committee be authorised to sign off the Stage D proposals for the Chichester Campus and their submission to Chichester District Council for planning clearance.*

67. Patrick Green questioned what the position was regarding the hotel proposal for the Chichester Campus. Shelagh Legrave stated that the RPA had indicated that this would not need to be accounted for until Phase 2 of the project. David Smith stated that as yet no expression of interest had been made by any of the potential developers that had been approached. Whether this was due to the current economic climate of other considerations was not clear. Richard Parker suggested that whether or not this was a realistic proposition it was important that the College was seen to be exploring the potential to raise additional assets to support funding the project.

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

68. David Smith suggested that whilst the next meeting of the Committee was timetabled for 8 January it would be more appropriate to hold it after the Regional Committee met on 12 January to consider the College's AiP. It was

**Resolved:**

*That the next meeting of the Committee be held on Tuesday, 13 January 2009 at 4.00pm.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date