

GREENHEAD COLLEGE CORPORATION
Minutes of Capital Development Committee meeting held virtually using Teams
Monday 5 July 2021, 4.30pm

Govs present: Chantal Forrest; Craig Shannon; Danyaal Malik; James Reeve (to 6.53pm); John Holroyd; Richard Armstrong (Chair); Richard King; Simon Lett (Principal); Stuart Irving; Vic Wright (to 6.47pm)

In attendance: Kevin Crotty (DfE) (to 5.45pm); John Blake; Ian Leedham (Clerk)

Apologies: none

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1. Welcome, apologies	RAR welcomed members and specifically Kevin Crotty, Project Director, DfE, as an external invitee. All present.	
2. Declarations	No declarations of pecuniary/prejudicial interest.	
3. Minutes 24/3/21	Capital Development Committee 24/3/21 minutes, previously circulated, approved; no matters arising.	Clerk note
4. Capital development progress & next steps <i>(note: Kevin Crotty DfE present for discussions summarised in mins 4.1-4.6: in some cases, these discussions were revisited later in the meeting, after Kevin's departure)</i>	4.1 Kevin Crotty DfE update: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> series of pre-contract contractor meetings held to resolve outstanding design & cost issues before final contract agreement could be undertaken: these now successfully completed with matters resolved; current work to finalise contract with GTry (imminent); then detailed design stage complex scheme due to site space constraints, coal seam discovery, Planning constraints, Sport England (Sp Eng) interface (statutory consultee, ongoing liaison), GTry control option revision, sustainability including Net Zero Carbon implications, GTry ongoing liaison to meet Planning requirements – these factors have contributed to delays to finalising Planning Application essential for DfE to end up with what it views as a deliverable sustainable development contract is between DfE & GTry contractor, with DfE role including representing College interests current timeline: Planning Application Aug 2021 (GTry lead, detail to be shared with Cttee); start on site Jan 2022 (previously Autumn 2021); new building handover Oct 2023 (previously Summer 2023); further work on other parts of site up to final completion Spring 2025 more detailed timetable to emerge once Planning Approval secured 	

7. College engagement (further Client Engagement Meetings, **CEMs**) important over Summer Holidays but DfE/GTry to minimise meetings during this period so as not to overload S.L.T. during the summer break.

4.2 Committee questions & discussion at three main levels:

1. at level of existing DfE new build scheme, **questions & discussion** majored on Sport England interface (min 4.3) & risks including slippage against previous timeline and managing these risks and their consequences (min 4.4)
2. Cttee revisited long-running debates, in context of increasing current & future demand for places, about supplementing DfE re-build/replacement scheme with expansion scheme (min 4.5)
3. in context of both the above, Cttee discussed need for College to consider Project Manager role (min 4.6).

4.3 Sport England interface. Responding to Committee questions, Kevin confirmed that:

1. loss (non-reinstatement) of College all-weather pitch 4-court provision (MUGA) is trigger for Sp Eng
2. Sp Eng issues will be resolved as part of Planning Application process; College might have to part-fund appropriate replacement MUGA provision
3. **SLE & RAR asked** whether Sp Eng is sighted via DfE in respect of College's wider plans, notably replacement & enhanced Sports Hall – Kevin pointed out that Sp Eng would look at Planning Application per se, its focus would be MUGA loss compared with past provision & sport provision national standards, and it would see Sports Hall plans as aspiration rather than reality – agreed DfE to keep College updated on its ongoing Sp Eng discussions.

Kevin DfE

4.4 Committee questioned & pushed on risks including slippage against previous timeline, and managing these risks & their consequences:

1. risks remain in relation to Planning Application and potential related Sp Eng issues, and to potential GTry contractor delays going forward, amongst other things
2. discussion, in response to **CSH & RAR questions & points**, of how College can be better sighted on full range of risks identified by DfE/GTry, so it can build this into its plans: Kevin confirmed DfE will share identified risks as part of upcoming CEMs and GTry will do likewise as part of regular GTry-College engagement including weekly meetings (whilst stopping short of sharing DfE/GTry risk registers per se)
3. **CFO asked** about potential contractual remedies relating to any future GTry contractor delays, e.g. in relation to additional decant costs caused by delayed move to new building – Kevin confirmed this could be discussed
4. discussion of how to mitigate disruption (including cross-College routes, study environment, exams, reputational

Kevin DfE

<p>[Kevin Crotty departed 5.45pm]</p>	<p>& student intake issues): Kevin confirmed DfE/GTry always open to discussing these & related issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. practically, College looking at potential 2-week half-term & more remote delivery Oct 2023 to support new building handover 6. towards end of meeting, RKI requested a paper covering consequences of existing known slippage & potential future slippage – SLE/JBL to draft & share by email in advance of next Cap Devt Cttee 6/9/21. <p>4.5 Of vital importance to College, Cttee questioned Kevin about need & potentials to supplement DfE re-build scheme (replacing inadequate facilities) with expansion scheme in context of increasing current & future demand for places (2,700+ Sep 2021, further increases thereafter unless admissions criteria raised):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SIR asked about Kevin’s position within wider DfE structure: Kevin is Project Director in DfE School Rebuilding Division (line manager James Stuart-Mills), Sharon is Project Manager; Mace has DfE technical advisory role 2. RAR asked about relationship within DfE between its School Rebuilding Div and expansion programme, and who to speak to regarding the latter: following discussion, these appear to be quite separate (later in meeting: they appear to only come together at Ministerial & Permanent Secretary level) – Kevin agreed to speak with expansion programme contact to find out more about their requirements 3. Committee reiterated its view that DfE needs to dovetail its replacement & expansion programmes, progressing both simultaneously given rising demand for places now & over time 4. these issues to be discussed in upcoming CEMs. <p>4.6 Committee discussed potential need for College to appoint part-time new build Project Manager, in response to JBL (& RAR) question to Kevin. Important to establish nature of role, dovetailing with existing DfE/GTry project management & Q.A. arrangements, focusing on progress chasing & responding to emerging situations, taking pressure off S.L.T., along with managing interface between DfE scheme and College-led expansion scheme. Agreed SLE/JBL to draft an options appraisal regarding this.</p> <p>4.7 SLE introduced his briefing document & associated Mace slides in relation to further expansion works, both previously circulated. Key points regarding these documents & the specific options therein included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. discussions yet to be held with Depts impacted by the options, e.g. Music, Drama, PE re Park Building options 2. general view, e.g. expressed by SLE & JRE, and Mace, that Park Bldg refurb options are more risky & less 	<p>SLE/JBL</p> <p>Kevin DfE</p> <p>SLE/JBL</p>
---------------------------------------	---	--

	<p>attractive: following CSH question, agreed SLE to ask Mace to firm up whether refurb is feasible option, or not</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. JRE pointed to need to focus more on performing arts (Music, Drama) and potential opportunity to build in community use and commercial angles too 4. envisaged Mace will be in position to do full presentation to Cap Devt Cttee 6/9/21 or later in Sep (in which case, CDC mtg would be pushed back to accommodate this). <p>4.8 RAR reiterated that pressures of student numbers (now & future) are especially acute in respect of laboratory requirements, most notably Biology & Chemistry. Related discussion of DfE lab specifications, where JBL clarified in response to CSH question that 90m2 space requirement in SFCs is for 24 students (or 30 secondary school students), and that existing labs are 88-90m2 range. RAR asked whether two labs at 90m2 each would be sufficient to meet College's capacity requirements, or whether smaller labs x 4 (with reduced student capacities) would be preferred – SLE argued and Cttee agreed that latter option not fit for purpose, underlined by Biology & Chemistry Heads being keen to meet 90m2 standard. SIR, based on past experience, pointed out that College needs to be ready to specify lab requirements in much detail, at the next stage.</p> <p>4.9 CSH brought a fundamental challenge in that the options presented, and the questions they beg, cannot be properly considered without addressing underlying issues of capacity potentials & constraints. This needs to be framed in context of wider debate on key strategic matters including second site, replacement site(s), further timetable model changes, hybrid face-to-face & remote delivery models, enabling IT developments, and implications for student population & admission criteria both globally and for individual subjects. Govs' Strategy Devt Day 1/12/21 will be key forum for these underpinning, wider discussions and decisions – importantly, full Mace report will feed into this.</p> <p>4.10 Committee discussed two elements of capital development communications planning:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. plan for how Corporation will manage communications from Sep 2021, with key input from VWR 2. linked, how Corporation can put political pressure on DfE to allow College to bring together much-needed expansion build alongside DfE re-build scheme, in context of DfE rebuild and expansion programmes not working collaboratively and only appearing to come together at Ministerial & Permanent Secretary level. 	<p>SLE</p> <p>Clerk re agenda</p> <p>VWR</p> <p>(RAR, VWR)</p>
<p>5. IT requirements</p>	<p>SLE/JBL to feed IT requirements in to future CEMs.</p>	<p>SLE/JBL</p>

6. Site security: access vulnerabilities impinging on G.Try's work	<p>SLE/JBL to feed two sets of issues in to future CEMs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. specified-area site vulnerabilities 2. ongoing concerns around risks linked to student travel between buildings during build process, especially to/from Rostron Bldg (where students will have to walk on busy Greenhead Rd) – GTry has informed college of its plans, including widening walkway; Highways aware. 	<p>SLE/JBL</p>
7. Risk & audit	<p>Main discussion points & actions linking to New Build Risk Register, previously re-circulated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. see min 4.4 above in respect of risk issues 2. agreed it would be helpful to have Audit & Risk Cttee representation in upcoming CEM(s) – SLE to discuss with RAR once C.E.M. schedule available 3. meeting held with Ian Harmer, AuditOne, regarding Capital Devt Project Management Audit 2021/22; AuditOne/Ian to help further develop Risk Register based on AuditOne expertise and Ian's experience as Vice-Chair of Single Academy Trust in Doncaster, which is also involved in DfE rebuild scheme 4. agreed SLE/JBL to update Risk Register, to include full range of risks including those outside of College control, and as informed by discussion of DfE/GTry risk registers and feedback from other Committees, in time for next Cap Devt Cttee meeting 6/9/21. 	<p>SLE, RAR</p> <p>SLE/JBL</p>
8. Policies & procedures	<p>8.1 No policies/procedures to review on this occasion.</p> <p>8.2 CSH asked whether a (DfE, GTry, College) procedure is in place whereby issues can be raised, escalated, resolved, logged – not currently – needs to be developed as part of a formalised project management approach (e.g. along PRINCE2 lines) – SLE/JBL to consider & action.</p>	<p>SLE/JBL</p>
9. AoB	<p>None.</p>	
10. Confidentiality	<p>Confidential aspects taken into account in drafting these minutes – no outstanding confidential matters.</p>	
11. Date next meeting	<p>Cap Devt Cttee Mon 6 Sep, 5.15pm (immediately after F&E 4.00pm), format TBC – noted this date provisional & might be pushed back 1-2 weeks – SLE to liaise with RAR/Clerk.</p>	<p>Govs note; SLE</p>

Minutes prepared by Ian Leedham (Clerk to the Corporation) on 8/7/21

Signed off by Richard Armstrong, Chair, at Capital Development Committee 17/11/21