

BRIGHTON HOVE & SUSSEX SIXTH FORM COLLEGE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PREMISES SUB-COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY 21st DECEMBER 2006 AT 9.30 A.M. IN ROOM 151, COLLEGE HOUSE

Present: Peter Freeman (Chair), Howard Kidd, Rod Mallinder, Chris Thomson.

In Attendance: Richard Hopkinson (NEA), Maria Bailey, Jutta Knapp, Louise Pennington,

The meeting was quorate.

1. Apologies and Welcomes

Chris Wellings sent his apologies.

Action

2. Minutes of the Meeting held on 5th October 2006

The minutes were approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record of the meeting.

FILE

3. Matters Arising

JHK reported that the post-project review in respect of the DDA capital works last Summer had been received yesterday and that the details would be passed on to Governors in due course.

JHK

4. Appointment of Consultants

It was noted that a meeting had been held between PF, CT, JHK, RH (NEA) and the LSC yesterday regarding BHASVIC's capital project proposals, the result of which may have an impact on the decision-making required.

JHK introduced the paper to the Committee and in particular directed the Committee to the possible risk elements connected to the project. The following points were noted and comments made:

- a) If consultants are appointed to undertake all the work required to the point of construction (Stage H) and either LSC consent or planning permission is subsequently refused, then the financial risk to the College could be in the region of £800,000.
- b) LSC locally and the national property adviser indicated on 20th December that they believe we can take the risk of pressing ahead. Support will be given to a project, subject to the Accord producing a satisfactory Education Case which is agreeable to all three parties, whilst also meeting the LSC's criteria and subject to the completion of further work required on the property and finance cases.
- c) LSC funding support is available up to a maximum of £100,000 for stage 2 (up to an

- Application in Principle and up to £1M for a detailed Application at the approved % support).
- d) Consideration was given to delaying the instructions to the consultants to proceed beyond Stage D until after confirmation for the project had been confirmed by the LSC, but this would delay the completion of the first phase of the project by about 6 months. It was noted that this would have an effect on the curriculum as the demolition of the link building would have to take place during term time. If the link building was timetabled to be demolished in say September/October, it may be possible to house students within College House and the Huts. Weekends could be used for very noisy work. Furthermore the LSC is encouraging at present in its support for the implementation of a capital project and a delay may have an impact, not least as a result of the need to demonstrate a positive NPV.
 - e) With regard to a delay to the proposals and the effects on the curriculum, this will be depend upon the capital plans of other Colleges which may effect recruitment, should BHASVIC fail to keep pace with capital developments. Any delay in completion to September 2009 would have an effect on the College's anticipated increase in numbers for the 2008/09 year. The effect upon the science curriculum would also be a factor. Isabelle Wragg has indicated that if further temporary accommodation is needed (i.e. more Huts) then this aspect could be included within the project but this would have an effect upon the NPV too. It was agreed that it was essential to link the demolition of classrooms with other available space (existing or temporary).
 - f) There may be unanticipated delays regarding the LSC application process in terms of the detailed approvals before proceeding with Phase 1 which could also impact upon the final completion date and would be particularly important in the effect this may have on students and staff.
 - g) RH reported upon the LSC's comments at yesterday's meeting with the College Management/PF, advising that entry 23 of the Master Programme, as given on page 9 of the papers, would have to be increased from 2 weeks to 12 weeks re "LSC final approval to Phase 1". However LSC have agreed that within the 12 week period, the tender results which form part of this submission, could be given 3 weeks before the end of this 12 week period. It was agreed that RH should confirm this point with them in writing and let them have a revised programme reflecting this change. RH suggested that the line 23 entry

could be moved 10 weeks earlier in the chart. **RH**
RH explained that a significant amount of work required in respect of the full application approval would be finished by the architectural team before the end of Stage D (entry 18 on the Chart – end April 2007). RH suggested that approval of reserved matters by the local authority should take significantly less time. Once the full submission has been made by the College/NEA it should be possible to establish whether there will be any significant objections quite quickly (any conditions and reserved matters should also be identified at this time) and hence whether the application is required to go the LA Committee stage for review/approval or be delegated to LA officers for processing. The latter being a much quicker route.

- h) The effect of the forthcoming local government elections (May 2007) upon the College's proposed application was discussed and the uncertainty which this may have on the length of time required for processing the application. It was important to obtain outline planning approval in April 2007 before the elections, if it is agreed to proceed on the current (amended) timetable, with the approval of reserved matters arising after the elections.
- i) Following a suggestion from RM, RH agreed to add additional time (additional 2 weeks) within the programme proposed for tendering process for Stage 1, before commencement of works on site.
- j) RH agreed to provide more detail within the plan with regard to other deadlines, including items such as submission for approval of reserved matters.
- k) Appointment of Project Manager (PM) is crucial to the immediate on-going work of the capital project. The first task of the PM would be to appoint the consultants required and to agree the best procurement route forward. It was agreed that the effect of the PM on tightly monitoring and controlling the consultants, with formal stage handovers was crucial in controlling costs, with built in break points, should the need arise to limit the overall project. **RH**
- l) The alternative design and build (D &B) approach was discussed and again it was agreed that the PM appointment was crucial to this decision-making process. D & B route would involve a longer tender period (estimated 8 plus 4 weeks) and there would be more exposure to additional costs, should the College wish to change any of the design plans agreed.
- m) Consideration was given to submitting Phases 1 and 2 to the LSC for approval as one project

which would also delay the commencement of works. This would allow more time to discuss the front end detail and it would be possible to have sectional handovers by the contractors throughout the project. The effect of inflation is likely to be more evident though.

- n) General concern was expressed by the Group that the timetable was very tight particularly with regard to the various uncertainties (i.e. time for planning application approval and wanted some assurance that the timetable was realistically achievable. RH agreed that the timetable was tight, but thought it was possible to achieve, despite being ambitious. Obviously if the College opts to delay the instructions of consultants (as specified in d) above), there would be less likelihood of timetable slippage.
- o) Following the meeting with the LSC yesterday and the assurances given, the financial risk to the College arising from LSC financial support not being available, is small.

The application must be approved by the Corporation via Finance & General Purposes Committee and it was noted that a Corporation meeting was scheduled for 8th February 2007 (re Assistant Principal appointment) and that an F & GP Meeting could not be scheduled prior to this. The Committee and Corporation's final decision making would be partly based on the input of the new Project Manager re the procurement route and the phasing of the project; hence the need to make this appointment asap. The F & GP Committee and the Corporation's next meetings (after 8th February Corporation meeting) are scheduled for 19th March and 29th March respectively. This will be reviewed when the revised Gantt chart is provided by NEA.

It was agreed that the next step would be to appoint a Project Manager asap in order to move the project forward in a controlled manner. RH would revise the gantt chart taking account of the points made above.

5. Appointment of Project Manager

JHK presented the paper to the Meeting, the contents of which were noted and approved.

It was agreed that the interview panel for the Project Manager appointment would comprise PF, RM, HK, CT and JHK and that JHK would arrange a date for interview.

Owing to the tight timetable, concern was expressed regarding the time available to complete the tender process for the architects, noting that this could not commence until the PM had been appointed. RM advised that it was usual to request proposals for more than one procurement route from architects invited to tender for the capital project. It was noted that a short time period, say two weeks, for tender submissions was also acceptable. It was agreed that as soon as the PM had been appointed, he/she should be asked to prepare tender documentation in respect of the

JHK

consultants required and at the same time consider the most appropriate procurement route. It was suggested that the time frame would be that a 4 week period following the PM appointment, would allow sufficient time for the PM to recommend a procurement route, programme details and tender documentation production and then proceed to the tender process, involving another 2/3 weeks.

Concern was expressed that the capital project should not be rushed and that it was important to allow sufficient time to deal with the detailed aspects of the project. Further discussion was held regarding the tight timetabling in respect of Phase 1 and it was agreed that further consideration should be given to this.

It was agreed that future Premises Group meetings should be arranged as necessary.

With regard to the financial issues relating to the capital project, HK/JHK agreed that F & GP Committee in the first instance, would need to have sight of a timetable with details of cash flow/bank borrowings etc. The next meeting of the F & GP Committee is scheduled for Monday 19th March 2007, but another meeting may need to be scheduled prior to this. The timetable should include key financial dates, Premises Group meeting dates and with input from the newly appointed PM too relating to the capital programme.

RH/PF

6. Any Other Business

CT reported that with regard to the Education Case, MPB was continuing to work with the Accord on this.

7. Date of Next Meeting

HK/JHK

To be agreed.

Louise Pennington
Clerk to the Corporation

CHAIRMAN..... DATE.....

DRAFT