CONFIRMED

ANGLIA RUSKIN UNIVERSITY

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

ESTATES COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Estates Committee held on 28 February 2019 by video conference in TIN 311, Tindal Building, Chelmsford and HEL201, Helmore Building, Cambridge.

PRESENT:	Dr N Brown	(Chair)
	Ms I Calambokis	
	Ms J Carr	
	Dr J Keddie	
	Mr G Reid	
	Mr A Sharples	
IN ATTENDANCE:	Ms Z Asensio-Sanchez	
	Mr P Bogle	(Clerk)
	Mr M Frost	
	Mr P Hegarty	
	Mr A Lefley	
	Mrs J Powell	
	Mr J Rolfe	
	Prof R Watkins	

Action

292. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

292.1 There were no declarations of interest.

293. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

293.1 There were no apologies for absence.

294. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

294.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 1 October 2018 were **AGREED** as an accurate record.

295. MATTERS ARISING

295.1 The Vice Chancellor gave a summary update in relation to matters arising and recent developments as it was noted that the operating context was now quite different to the situation in October.

295.2 Since the last Committee meeting there had been a number of new appointments which included a new Director of Estates, a Chief Operating Officer and a new Vice Chancellor, all of which were now in post and this had impacted on estates matters. Student recruitment was proving to be more challenging than originally thought and there was also a significant change in the type of students applying to ARU with further increases in

degree apprenticeship numbers and a declining undergraduate student population.

295.3 The Augar review which was now expected to be announced no sooner than late April was likely to introduce a mechanism to cap fees and would present another financial challenge.

295.4 The situation with Howes Close had moved on and management had taken the decision to pause progress with the project at present in order to fully investigate other possibilities for the site. The Vice Chancellor explained that it was important to ensure that to continue with the project would be providing the best value for money for students and this needed to be carefully tested.

295.5 In relation to the Engineering Strategy a budget of £8 million had been discussed at the Board and whether this might be increased to £11 million in order to underpin an ERDF bid. However the business case underpinning the ERDF Funding Bid needed further examination, and it was possible that the original Engineering Strategy investment of £8 million would remain the preferred option.

295.6 A capital plan would be prepared setting out the priorities and although management was keen not to delay any project unnecessarily they were aware of the current risks and the need to recommend investment decisions to the Board which clearly represented value for money.

295.7 In response to a question by the Chair about what was currently the most immediately urgent priority project, it was reported that priorities included developments for the Engineering Strategy (Chelmsford), Creative Industries (Cambridge) and progressing with the Sawyers/Tindal extension in Chelmsford.

295.8 A query was raised about the longer term thinking behind the 10 year capital investment plan which was referenced at the last meeting. In response to this it was reported that the aim was for the plan to provide details about prioritisation within the realms of the currently predicted envelope, the order in which to carry out activities and investment in both the Cambridge and Chelmsford Masterplans.

295.9 It was reported that the current profile was the same as before in that the volume of capital had not yet been adjusted and management was currently focussing on what was happening both in the wider market and locally and what impact this had on ARU's priorities for capital projects including any changes that might be beneficial.

RW/MF

295.10 In terms of the masterplan it was about establishing a profiling plan to be incorporated into the capital investment portfolio which would be reported to the Board together with the capital plan.

296. ESTATES MATTERS

296.1 The Committee considered a report regarding estates matters.

296.2-10 *Please see confidential minutes.*

<u>Harlow Innovation Centre</u>

296.11 The construction was proceeding well and was expected to be completed on target for August 2019.

School of Medicine

296.12 There were some ongoing snagging issues regarding the landscaping scheme which was being resolved by the main contractor and also in relation to the installation of additional handrails to the steps leading up to the main entrance which was being addressed.

296.13 An official opening date for the Medical School had been scheduled for 14th June and governors will be invited to attend. **RW/PB**

9 Collier Road

296.14 The refurbishment works had been completed and the property was due to be marketed next week.

Long term maintenance project status

296.15 The concrete repairs at Guild House had now been completed.

296.16 The replacement of the Queens building roof was in progress although there had been a slight delay in getting some tiles from Spain.

296.17 All other maintenance projects which had been deferred from 2017/18 had all been completed except for the Coslett stairway which was included in the schedule for the current year for completion by Summer 2020.

297. UPDATE ON CAPITAL PROJECTS UNDERTAKEN AND PROPOSALS FOR THE NEXT YEAR

297.1 The Committee received an update on capital projects undertaken during the Winter period.

297.2 The Chelmer Building extension works had been tendered.

298. DEVELOPING THE ESTATES STRATEGY

298.1 The Committee considered a report on progress with the draft Estates Strategy document which would be presented to the Committee in May.

298.2 It was reported that in putting together a new estates strategy the aim was to strengthen the work and remit of the Estates and Facilities Services as a keen enabler to how the university works and ensure it supports and aligns with the current strategies in place and includes input from key stakeholders.

298.3 The team was looking to provide innovative solutions to create agile and flexible spaces aiming to improve student experience. There was a need to build on creating a high performance culture.

298.4 The Committee was pleased to hear about the aims to improve the student experience and considered that it was important to ensure that the student experience was at the heart of the strategy from start to finish.

298.5 It was acknowledged that there were a lot of unknown and challenging external factors at the moment but it was considered important to put together a framework setting out ARU's priorities for the future.

299. CONTINUING WORK ON THE CAMBRIDGE MASTERPLAN

299.1 The Committee received an update on the Cambridge masterplan.

299.2 It was reported that the draft document had been submitted to the planning authority and a formal response was awaited. The initial consultation involved a two hour meeting and presentation and there had been initial positive feedback to the document which was thought to be a very cohesive masterplan. The planners were interested in looking at other possibilities for the East Road development and they wanted to refer it to a number of their departments before making a decision.

299.3 The one thing the planners would not be drawn on was whether there was any way in which we could formally adopt the masterplan as they did not really have the authority to do this and it would not allow for the flexibility that might be needed in the future.

299.4 Committee members considered that to have a clear and coherent plan to discuss with the planners was a good position to be in.

299.5 A question was raised about how much this draft took into account changes which were not just cosmetic but would have a genuine effect on the student experience. The driver for the masterplan has been about improving the student experience but this did not necessarily come through strongly in the presentation given to the board in February.

299.6 It was reported that the greatest sense of positive feedback and endorsement for the Cambridge masterplan was when it was presented to CMT who could see the potential for aligning this with planned changes to the curriculum. Although CMT had initially received a less detailed presentation than that which came to the board it was the resulting discussions and conversation that was significant.

299.7 The main differences between the Chelmsford and Cambridge masterplan was that the Cambridge masterplan had a greater sense of doing things differently. The aim was for the masterplan to translate into improved student experience in a modern, inclusive atmosphere which will attract students to study at ARU.

299.8 There were specified criteria to consider with the architect as to the way in which to approach the development which was an ambitious scheme. The plans for the Ruskin building included the creation of shared spaces with visibility through the main campus. It was noted that there were earmarked sums set aside for various parts of the plan.

299.9 A query was raised about whether the planning assumptions which were based on having an additional 600 students in Cambridge was realistic. In response to this it was reported that across the sector there was a consensus that student numbers are unlikely to significantly increase in the short to medium term because of demographics and the potential reintroduction of capping. However, this would in turn prevent the government from being able to deliver on its aim to make higher education

available to all through widening participation and social mobility. The ambition was to become more competitive in the market.

299.10 The Committee broadly supported the development of the masterplan which would take into account stakeholder engagement. The team would also engage with the planning authority to establish principles for development in the first draft of the masterplan. It was considered important to ensure that the right process was followed for the development of the various phases of the masterplan with each individual capital project underpinned by a robust business case.

299.11 The Committee was invited to share any particular points of concern regarding the masterplan with the Director of Estates and Facilities. An update would be provided at the next Estates Committee in May. **ZA-S**

300. CONTINUING WORK ON THE CHELMSFORD MASTERPLAN

300.1 The Committee received an update on progress with the Chelmsford masterplan.

300.2 The initial view from planners was luke-warm as they had expected an initial approach with draft proposals which would then be drafted in to a masterplan. The planners were quite wedded to the previous masterplan and wanted more information about the thought process for the current proposals and how these had been developed. The planners were also concerned about the road network surrounding the Chelmsford campus.

300.3 A view had been taken to hold development of the masterplan at the end of last year due to the Arise project in progress at that time. In reconsidering the masterplan it was necessary to further involve the SU and other stakeholders with the Chelmsford plan and to ensure that the plan aligns with and meets academic needs and requirements.

300.4 The initial masterplan review had not addressed the fact that a medical school had been adopted on the Chelmsford campus and it was important to ensure this was included as a driver for future change opportunity. The masterplan was currently being reviewed and required a bit longer to develop and to be clear on both strategic drivers and visions and the academic needs it serves.

ZA-S

300.5 An update would be provided to the Committee in May with a more meaningful plan being presented at the October meeting.

301. AMENDMENTS TO COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

301.1 The Committee received a report and proposed amendments to the Committee terms of reference. The amendments were proposed following an internal audit which had recommended changes to the terms of reference to include details of the purpose of the Committee, a clearer status about its remit and the usual required frequency of meetings

301.2 The Committee **APPROVED** the proposed amendments subject to the addition of the word “proposals” after the word “of” in the first paragraph of the wording for the section on Purpose, and recommended the amendments to the Board. **PB/JP**

302. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

302.1 It was noted that the next meeting of the committee would take place on the first available date after Tuesday 7th May 2019. **PB/JP**

Chair _____ Date