



## **ESTATES MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday 22 January 2014**

### **MINUTES**

*PRESENT:*

President and Provost (*Chair*)

Professor Stephen Caddick

Professor Richard Catlow Profem/ Stephen Caddick

7nCaddick

ht

**Preliminary Business**

**26 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 30 OCTOBER 2013**

**Confirmed:**

- 26.1 The Minutes of the meeting of EMC held on 30 October 2013 [EMC Mins. 13-25, 30.10.13]

**27 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

[See also Minutes 28 and 30 below]

**27A Finance Committee and Council approval of recommendations from EMC**

**Noted:**

- 27A.1 At its meeting on 30 October 2013, EMC approved the following proposals which were subsequently referred to, and approved by, FC at its meeting on 14 November 2013 and then Council at its meeting on 27 November 2013:

Wilkins North Terrace, Refectory and Bloomsbury Theatre;  
Kathleen Lonsdale Building Refurbishment;  
Wates House Re-development.

**Matters for Discussion**

**28 CAPITAL PROGRAMME PRIORITISATION [EMC Min. 14B, 30.10.13]**

**Noted:**

intended to ensure that UCL's capital programme is developed and managed in a financially sustainable manner

**Discussion:**

28.4 The following points were noted during EMC's discussion:

There was unanimous support for the process outlined in the paper, which was seen as an important step in improving UCL's capital programme planning and prioritisation.

It was agreed that the development of student-facing facilities should feature more prominently in the prioritisation criteria.

It was noted that the role of the proposed Capital Programme Sub-Committee would be to evaluate and prioritise projects before they are submitted to EMC for approval and, if necessary, subsequently referred to FC and Council for final approval.

With regards to the membership of the Sub-Committee, it was agreed that (i) all of the Vice-Provosts and the lead Dean from each School should, *inter alia*, be members and would be expected to attend all meetings, and (ii) in the interests of consistency, the Vice-Provosts would not be able to nominate alternates to attend meetings in their place, while the lead Dean from each School would only be able to nominate one of their fellow Deans from the same School to attend meetings in their place in the most exceptional circumstances.

It was agreed that terms of reference for the Sub-Committee would be drawn-up and brought back to EMC for its approval.

**RESOLVED**

28.5 That EMC approve the paper at EMC 3-22 (13-14) and the proposals contained therein, subject to the points raised in the foregoing discussion.

**[ACTION: Rex Knight – to note]**

**29 BIDBOROUGH HOUSE – PROCESS FOR SELECTION OF USE**

**Received:**

29.1 A report on the above at EMC 3-23 (13-14), presented by the Director of Estates.

**Reported:**

29.2 Now that UCL had been confirmed as the preferred bidder for Bidborough House, a process needed to be agreed for determining optimal usage of the building. The paper proposed an open competition in which Faculties and Professional Services, individually or in combination, could submit proposals for use of the space, which would be considered and prioritised by the new Capital Programme Sub-Committee, with a view to a final decision being made by EMC. Two outline proposals had already been considered: (i) the relocation of Professional Services Divisions, which would release space on the main campus for other purposes, and (ii) creation of teaching and administrative space for the

***Discussion:***

- 29.3 While EMC agreed that a clear process was required to determine the use of the space at Bidborough House, members were concerned that an open competition might result in significant time and effort being spent on preparing proposals which would ultimately be

On Boston House, while EMC recognised that UCL may need to move quickly in relation to this new leasehold space, a full business case would have to be prepared and submitted to EMC members and then to FC to ensure that due process is followed.

With regards to Russell House, EMC supported the academic case for the proposal but asked for the original business case to be re-worked. EMC would wish to see the revised business case and FC approval would be needed.

**RESOLVED:**

30.4 That EMC welcome the report at EMC 3-24 (13-14).

**[ACTION: Andrew Grainger – to note]**

30.5 That business cases relating to Boston House and Russell House be brought back to EMC at its next meeting.

**[ACTION: Dave Smith]**

|                             |
|-----------------------------|
| <b>Matters for Approval</b> |
|-----------------------------|

**31 BIOSCIENCES ALTERATIONS**

**Received:**

31.1 The above proposal, as set out at EMC 3-37 (13-14).

**Reported:**

31.2 The proposal related to a number of alterations to space occupied by the Division of Biosciences.

**Discussion:**

31.3 EMC agreed that while it supported the academic case for the above project, the business

## 32 UCL-RNOH BIOENGINEERING HUB (STANMORE)

### **Received:**

- 32.1 The above proposal, as set out at EMC 3-25 (13-14).

### **Reported:**

- 32.2 The project, which involved a major collaboration between UCL (specifically the Faculty of Engineering Sciences and the Faculty of Medical Sciences) and the NHS, would involve the expansion and improvement of teaching facilities at the Stanmore site.

### **Discussion:**

- 32.3 EMC agreed that while it supported the academic case for the above project, the business case needed to be re-worked.
- 32.4 The Provost observed that in the case of this proposal and the previous proposal, while the academic rationales for the projects were compelling, the associated business cases as presented to the Committee were inadequate. The Provost noted that there needed to be much better interaction and collaboration between staff within the Estates Division and the Finance Division in preparing estates proposals so that proposals are only submitted to EMC once the business cases have been carefully worked-up and jointly approved in advance. The new prioritisation process [see Minute 28 above] should help with this process. Furthermore, EMC supported the Provost's view that once the Capital Programme Sub-Committee was in place, all estates proposals should come to EMC *via* that group to ensure that all proposals are dealt with in the same way and are subject to the same level of scrutiny, especially if they require subsequent approval by FC and Council (subject to the proviso that there will be occasions where UCL will need to move more quickly due to the highly competitive nature of the property market in central London).

### **RESOLVED:**

- 32.5 That EMC approve the proposal at EMC 3-25 (13-14), subject to the business case being re-worked and approved.

**[ACTION: Dave Smith]**

- 32.6 That the Directors of Estates and Finance liaise to review the process for preparing business cases for estates proposals prior to their submission to EMC.

**[ACTION: Andrew Grainger, Phil Harding]**

## 33 STUDENT ACCOMMODATION

### **Received:**

- 33.1 At EMC 3-26 (13-14) the Student Accommodation Strategy Review (with Annexes 1-4), with the following supporting papers:

Nominations Agreements at EMC 3-27 (13-14);

Fees Proposals for 2014-15 at EMC 3-28 (13-14);

Ramsay Hall – Masterplan Feasibility at EMC 3-29 (13-14).

**Discussion:**

33.2 The paper at EMC 3-26 (13-14) set out five separate recommendations. EMC's views on

**35 PUBLIC ART STRATEGY**

**Received:**

- 35.1 The above proposal, as set out at EMC 3-31 (13-14).

**RESOLVED:**

- 35.2 That the proposal at EMC 3-31 (13-14) be approved, subject to clarification as to the next steps and likely costs.

**[ACTION: Dave Smith]**

**36 CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Received:**

- 36.1 The above proposal, as set out at EMC 3-32 (13-14).

**RESOLVED:**

- 36.2 That the proposal at EMC 3-32 (13-14) be approved, subject to the costs being found from within the Estates Division's budget.

**[ACTION: Andrew Grainger, Richard Jackson – to note]**

|                                       |
|---------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Matters for Information</b></p> |
|---------------------------------------|

**37 CAPITAL PROJECTS DASHBOARD**

**Noted:**

- 37.1 The above report at EMC 3-33 (13-14).

**38 PROJECT REVIEW GROUP (FORMERLY ESTATES APPROVAL COMMITTEE) – MINUTES AND DECISIONS**

**Noted:**

- 38.1 Minutes of the most recent meetings of the PRG at EMC 3-34 – 3-36 (13-14).



**39 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

***To note:***

39.1 The next meeting will be on **Wednesday 5 March 2014** at **8.30am** in the Council Room.

***Secretary's Note: the above meeting is scheduled for 8.30am – 11.00am and will now take place in the Provost's Office.***

JASON CLARKE  
Secretary to EMC]  
ii/2014