

**BRIGHTON HOVE & SUSSEX SIXTH FORM COLLEGE**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PREMISES GROUP HELD ON THURSDAY 11th  
JANUARY 2007 AT 9.30 A.M.  
IN ROOM 47.**

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

In Attendance: Jutta Knapp, Louise Pennington,

The meeting was quorate.

**1. Apologies and Welcomes**

There were no apologies.

**2. Minutes of the Meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> December 2006**

The minutes were approved, subject to the following amendments:

Item 4 penultimate paragraph and item 5 last paragraph: amend the minutes to reflect the possibility that another F & GP Committee meeting and Corporation meeting may be required, subject to new schedule/gantt chart from NEA.

**Action**

**LEP**

**3. Matters Arising**

The Group was reminded that the production of the capital bid was dependent upon the Accord finalising the education case to the LSC's satisfaction. It was agreed that the College should not be rushed into a quick decision, but that the appointment of the Project Manager was also crucial in moving the proposals forward. However it was noted that a draft timetable should be submitted to the LSC as a matter of urgency and it was resolved that JHK should submit NEA's revised chart, but emphasising to the LSC that this is a provisional working document and subject to change. This will enable the LSC to provisionally schedule their work to tie in with BHASVIC's proposals. JHK agreed to forward a copy of the revised Gantt chart to the Group Members (JHK, CT and RM have already had copies. CT indicated that the Education Case may be finalised by the end of the week.

**JHK**

In response to a question regarding financial implications to the College, it was noted that the College's financial contribution towards the College related solely to Phase 1 of the bid and that the intention was that Phases 2 and 3 would be met by 100% LSC funding. It would be possible subject to financial constraints to extend the provisional scheduling of Phases 2 and 3 if required. The Premises Group was concerned that the College should not be liable for additional costs, should Phase 1 of the project overrun.

#### 4. Post-Project Review Report

JHK presented the report to the Committee and the following points were noted:

- a) The contractor, Longley, did not attend the meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2006 and there had been several attempts to find meeting dates suitable for all parties. All other parties were present including BHASVIC, NEA, McBains Copper, Peter Dann Ltd, Butler & Young and Turner Townsend (TT). Gareth Morgan of TT facilitated the review and produced the report.
- b) The report covered three areas – start-up and design, Procurement and Construction and Handover and Operation. Within each of these areas, discussion was held during the review meeting and both “positives” and “do different” matters were identified. These were noted by the Premises Group members.
- c) The College’s problem with the individual Project Manager and his relationship with Longleys, was discussed and it was agreed that this issue should be raised at the forthcoming Capital Bid Project Manager interviews in order to identify whether any issue of this nature would be resolved swiftly by the consultants appointed.
- d) The Group gained reassurance from the Report that there was a limited amount which the College itself could have done to resolve any difficulties and that most of the issues identified were ones which the consultants should have done differently.
- e) It was noted that the LSC would not receive a copy of this report, but that a standard LSC form would be completed by the College and submitted to the LSC in due course.
- f) The College’s decision to select a two stage project was considered and in retrospect it was agreed that this route was not assisted by the poor working relationship between the PM and Longleys and also that Longleys had not been proactive in meeting the project timetable. In future it was recommended that it may be more beneficial to avoid a two stage tender process. It was noted that it would be better to take time to produce satisfactory tender documentation up to Stage E in order to better understand the risks upon the College and at the same time, not be totally dependent upon one contractor.
- g) It was also noted that the individual PM assigned to BHASVIC had changed three times with Durand Azariah being the third and final PM. Effective communication between BHASVIC and the all the contractors is paramount but this had

not always been the case. The College should have received more accurate advice regarding the impact (noise etc) of works on the operation of the College during normal working hours. Delays arising from this, increased time and cost (approximately £20,000 cost over budget based on a £2M project). It will be essential that this issue is addressed properly in the Capital bid.

- h) The impact of the LSC's role in the "do different" items listed on page 7 of the report, were noted and again this point must be understood fully by the Project Manager for the capital bid in order that the same mistakes are not made. **CT/JHK**
- i) With regard to the new capital bid it was agreed that sufficient time must be given to addressing all issues to ensure that the application includes all BHASVIC's requirements. **CT/JHK**
- j) It was agreed that the contingency level established, as referred to in the procurement and construction stage (page 8), was insufficient and that in future a more robust contingency level should be established to take account of unpredicted increased cost and time.

## 5. Project Manager Interview Questions

JHK tabled a list of questions used at the interview panel for the project manager appointed in respect of the DDA works which were noted.

The following list of questions was suggested and JHK agreed to draft a list for the forthcoming interviews:

- a) What factors would influence your recommendations as to the procurement route that should be followed?
- b) How do you propose to manage the cost control of the project – what procedures will you put in place if this becomes an issue?
- c) How do you propose to manage the progress of the project and the adherence to the programme? What procedures will you put in place if this becomes an issue?
- d) Please could you talk us through your proposed resource allocation.
- e) What action would you take if there was a personality clash between members of the Design Team and the designated project manager from your organisation? Would the appointed individual remain in that role for the life of the project?
- f) Clarification of fee proposal and breakdown of what is/is not included.
- g) Before the interview, request that the person to be assigned individual Project Manager by the consultancy, be included in the interview **JHK**

presentation. Also discuss the responsiveness of the consultancy to dealing with personality clashes between the individual PM and the BHASVIC staff.

JHK agreed to finalise the list of interview questions asap.

**6. Any Other Business**

There was not other business.

**7. Date of Next Meeting**

It was agreed that the next Premises Group meeting would be convened when NEA has produced the revised Gantt chart and the Project Manager has been appointed.

Louise Pennington  
Clerk to the Corporation

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

