

**GREENHEAD COLLEGE CORPORATION**  
**Minutes of Capital Development Committee meeting held virtually using Teams**  
**Wednesday, 28 February 2024, 4pm**

**Govs present:** Adrian Barrass; John Holroyd; Liz Bowen (from 16.05); Reuben Byfield; Richard Armstrong (Chair); Simon Lett (Principal)

**In attendance:** Richard King (Associate Governor) (from 16.09); Tom Rowley (Assistant Principal); Usman Anwar (Assistant Principal) (left 16.19); Lauren Metcalfe (DoFF); Sarah Walters (DoEO); Sharon Roper (Clerk)

**Apologies:** Elliot Gill; Mark Howells; Stuart Irving; Paddy Diamond

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<b>1. Welcome, apologies</b>	RAR welcomed members. Apologies received as above.	
<b>2. Declarations</b>	No declarations of pecuniary/prejudicial interest on the part of Governors or CLT participants.	
<b>3. Minutes 17/1/24</b>	<p><b>3.1</b> Capital Development Committee 17/1/24 minutes, previously circulated, minutes approved by Committee, signed by Chair, returned to Clerk for filing.</p> <p><b>3.2</b> Matters arising:</p> <p>1. (17/1/24 Min 4.12) Following the planned power outage at half term, there were no issues, and everything came back online.</p> <p>2. (17/1/24 Min 5.6) RAR and SLE attended SFCA winter conference, there was nobody from the ministerial team to question about capital and funding. There was an opposition spokesperson and a house select committee chair, delegates asked about this issue, no commitments were made. The Labour spokesperson said Labour would honour any inherited financial position before making decisions about future spend.</p> <p>SLE and RAR met with current MP's and parliamentary candidates for our area, discussions have included capital and revenue funding and the issues with one year funding. They were receptive and understood the position, but again no commitments.</p>	Clerk

<p><b>4. Update of DfE development</b></p>	<p><b>4. UAN and SWA gave a verbal update on the DfE development:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The new Muga was handed over today, any snags identified will be added to the existing snagging list. A tractor has also been provided to facilitate maintenance of the pitch. The MUGA does not have a net to catch stray balls landing in the car park, this was not included in the original building specification and GC will have to pay for this.</li> <li>2. Due to Phase 3 demolition due to start, the fire escape from the back of the library in the main building cannot be used as it goes into the hoarding area. An interim solution has been identified and the costs are being investigated.</li> <li>3. The demolition is due to start on 8<sup>th</sup> March. The contractors will crush everything on site, the noise this causes will be monitored. GT want to flatten this area by June and are starting at the side facing Greenhead Park. Extra asbestos was found on site.</li> <li>4. GT were stopped from working during exam season last year and they are aware that a stop notice might be issued again this year</li> <li>5. RAR asked if sound meters are in exam areas, GT have placed decibel meters around college. RAR asked for GC to purchase sound meters to monitor the tolerable level of noise so GT can be advised of this in advance of exams.</li> <li>6. Dust levels will also be monitored.</li> <li>7. 90 snags on the list have been closed but there are still snags outstanding, big issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seventeen ventilation units in Hirst were not fitted correctly or there is a manufacturing issue, the filters cannot be removed for cleaning. DfE and Mace are aware.</li> <li>• The toilets have been leaking and the handles are not working, these need stripping out and fixing.</li> </ul> </li> <li>8. There is a sculpture/mural in the old main hall called 'girls singing and playing' which is embedded into the wall and weighs fifteen tons. No provision was made to retain it. Huddersfield Civic Society contacted Historic England and lodged an application to add it to the listed buildings of architectural or historic interest, the Secretary of State for Culture, Media, and Sport has decided not to take this application forward to a full assessment.</li> <li>9. RAR thanked UAN and PDI for their work on the Hirst building and Phase 3.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>5. Post 16 Developments</b></p>	<p><b>5. SLE gave a verbal update on Post 16 developments:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. KNO is looking at what is possible in terms of future building development on the main campus.</li> </ol>	

	<p>2. KNO and SLE attended a meeting with the LA regarding the cultural heart development. GC has been offered the gallery plot, 2027 is a likely date but timescales are fluid. The space is similar to the infirmary plot, 3000 m2 over two floors, it would be used for STEM and technology based subjects.</p> <p>3. The LA wants a Memorandum of Understanding, SLE advised them that this cannot happen until after Strategy Day (17/4) when governors will discuss it, and this is dependent on the funding falling into place. Although we have a surplus, the LA has been made aware that match funding is required for any development. The estimated cost for this development is £14 million, an additional £8 million is needed from elsewhere. Approaches to West Yorkshire Combined Authority and a Levelling Up bid were mooted.</p> <p>A memorandum of Understanding is not a legal obligation.</p> <p>3. Tracy Brabin, West Yorkshire mayor, has been advised of our plans for future development and a meeting will be arranged with her to discuss this further.</p> <p>4. KNO is producing a prospectus about what GC is seeking to do, the University have provided a quote supporting us, and this will go to the Cabinet at the LA.</p> <p>5. Jason McCartney, MP, visited GC last week, he saw how busy Hirst building is, he was convinced that GC needs additional space. He was appraised of the cultural heart development, and the unsuccessful HRI bid, He is aware of the derelict Infirmary being an issue in the local community, SLE and RAR advised him this was GC's preferred site due to its proximity to GC.</p> <p>6. This academisation update is confidential.</p> <p>7. ABA said the HRI site did not proceed due to issues with cash flow and the cost of the cultural heart development is similar to the HRI site. He asked if LME was working on the financial forecasting models. SLE confirmed revised forecasts with sensitivity analyses to the end of the decade will come to Strategy Day.</p> <p>RAR said there may be an option for Kirklees to own the building and for GC to be leaseholders which will be a revenue call on GC but not a capital call. The LA were advised that we would want a long leasehold and be free to develop the cultural site as we want.</p> <p>RAR said Jason McCartney has a meeting scheduled with the chancellor and he will ask for commitments for Kirklees and GC in particular.</p>	<p>SLE</p> <p>LME</p>
<p><b>6. Potential sports development/ Highfields development</b></p>	<p>TRO gave a verbal update on a potential sports development at GC's Highfields site:</p> <p>1. Highfields playing fields are 15 minutes away from the main GC campus; they are used for football and rugby. Changing facilities are available onsite, although they have</p>	

been patched up and are not in a good state. GC's sporting facilities compared to our competitors is below par.

2. Although the new MUGA has been handed over, investment is needed in GC's other sporting facilities.

3. APE, HOD for PE, is looking into a FA Football Foundation Bid to create 4G pitches at Highfields. APE is familiar with this process from a similar process with his previous employers and has a contact with a consultant. The consultant takes a portion of the FA grant.

4. In December two representatives from the Football Foundation Bid visited the site to see if it is viable for GC to make a bid. They confirmed that there is a lack of facilities in the Kirklees area.  
There is an issue with parking at Highfields. The Football Foundation representatives said the slope on the site can be resolved.

5. There has been no further progress yet, TRO will consult with LME and SWA.

6. There are issues at Highfields with security due to its location.

7. If the bid is successful the Football Foundation will fund a 4G pitch and GC will need to contribute between 20-30%. The benefit to GC is an updated resource, which will eventually fund itself, be used by the local community and help build partnerships.

8. The process includes declaring ownership of the land and providing the deeds and entering into contracts with the respective parties.

9. RAR asked what the timelines are if a decision is made to proceed with the bid – there is no set deadline to make a bid, the full process can take between 12 to 18 months, and the build is relatively quick.

10. ABA asked if there are any downsides to this idea. The obligation is that the facilities are not exclusively for GC use, although renting it could be an effective way to promote GC. The bid may not be successful and there is an issue with parking for visitors. TRO said that an arrangement for parking might be available at the local primary school adjoining the site.  
When the pitches are rented out, security and staff will be required to run the facility.

11. ABA asked if there will be any grass pitches left after a successful bid.  
APE has suggested bidding for two pitches, which will not leave any grass pitches, PE department think this will be beneficial. GC's rugby teams currently use an alternative site.

12. RAR said a successful FA bid might release the new MUGA on the main site, this could be a potential development site for a new sports hall.  
RAR asked TRO to bring further details to discuss with governors at Strategy Day (17/3/24).

TRO

	<p>13. SWA asked if there are any limitations in terms of the agreement with DfE about building on the new MUGA site - there is not.</p> <p>14. TRO said the new MUGA does not comply with the correct size to use it for competitive sport. New pitches at Highfields would comply.</p>	
<p><b>7. New Build Risk Register</b></p>	<p>7. New Build Risk Register, previously circulated:</p> <p>1. CLT examined the risk register before half term and it was updated. A&amp;R committee reviewed the document on 26/2/24. The residual risks have been lowered for: (line 3) fire evacuation area is not large enough; a practice was successful although further fire evacuation practices will continue to take place. (line 4) deliveries to college; there have not been any issues since the new building opened. (line 15) Phase 3 accessibility for all students; the site is now DDA compliant. (line 19) Hirst building not being complete, there are residual issues in a snagging list which are being addressed.</p> <p>2. The big issues are: (line 5) demolition works during Phase 3 affecting teaching and learning; this is still an unknown. (line 11) building site makes estate security lockdown harder; SWA will update this. (line 14) Asbestos works; this risk will reduce as this phase is about to finish. (lines 27 &amp; 28) finance section, unforeseen costs; continued focus on contingency costs, although the budget has been recast and some of the contingency is now in non-pay lines.</p> <p>3. The new build risk register will sit with SWA, it will go to CLT and then out to the committees.</p> <p>4. Following A&amp;R meeting (26/2/24) the new format of the risk register was approved pending further discussion between SLE, SWA and EWY around the wording in the scoring matrix and how they match the scores in the residual risk. SWA will use this format for the main risk register.</p> <p>5. RKI said that A&amp;R committee asked for a history profile showing how the risks have changed. SLE said this will make the registers clearer for governors, showing the movement of the risks between meetings. RKI said some review dates are historic and this requires updating.</p>	<p>SWA</p> <p>SWA</p> <p>SWA</p>

	<p>6. RAR asked if the Internal Auditor (IA) was comfortable with the format – they were and suggested movement of the risks documenting (see above), and narrative around that. SWA will add two further columns, narrative from the last review, the movement of the risk and this will copy into the Risk Mitigation. This will allow governors to identify risks that have changed and the reasons why.</p> <p>7. RKI asked for a narrative expanding on the five main risks which governors can read before the meetings, reducing the time taken to discuss them. RAR clarified that this should be similar to the narrative that is produced in conjunction with the monthly accounts highlighting significant change over the risk items and red and amber risks with a high or increased score.</p>	<p>SWA</p> <p>SWA</p>
<b>8. AoB</b>	None	
<b>9. Confidentiality</b>	The organisations GC is having conversations with about academisation.	
<b>10. Future meetings</b>	Next CDC Meeting, Wed, 22 May 24, 4pm, Teams	Govs note

**Minutes prepared by Sharon Roper (Clerk to the Corporation) on 5/3/24**

**Approved & signed by Chair, Richard Armstrong on 22/5/24**