Imagine 2016

City University London: A leading global University committed to academic excellence, focused on business and the professions and located in the heart of London. We are proud of the quality of our education, research and enterprise and are ranked within the top 2% of universities in the world.
Executive Summary

City University’s estate is a valuable asset in the heart of London. In the coming years it must respond to a combination of legacy issues, such as loss of leased premises and a lack of student amenity provided, against a context of rising expectations. Our student population is set to grow along with academic aspirations, particularly in research.

The Estates Strategy has 3 main aims, to:

- Provide high quality academic space
- Recreate a sense of community and place
- Support School strategic plans

It will achieve these by progressing 2 parallel strands of work: firstly, to create a new main entrance complex, improve circulation and expand student facilities at our Northampton Square main campus. Secondly, to establish a world class education facility on our Sebastian Street site, designed to support academic study and research.

School plans have been considered carefully and provision has been made for the accommodation of new academic staff, PhD students and research activity in a series of projects that coordinate with the above.

This will require a total investment of just under £75M beyond that required to meet basic functional needs over the period. Given the need to deliver against challenging academic targets it is important that individual business cases are developed promptly to allow the necessary enabling works to proceed this year. The measures by which success will be judged include both the ability to attract and retain excellent academic staff, and positive feedback from our student community about the facilities we provide them with during their stay at City University.

The proposed plan is not without risk particularly around the availability of space and the complexity of work involved within operational buildings; however the estates team has a proven track record of delivery to a consistently high standard in such circumstances.

Kevin Gibbons, Director, Property & Facilities

March 2012
Introduction and context

This document replaces the previous Estates Strategy dated 2006 and should be read in conjunction with the University Strategic Plan dated March 2012.

It sets out a long-term physical infrastructure plan to support the University’s ambitions for the next 5 years, but with the longer term stewardship of the estate in mind. It forms the final part of City University’s Capital Investment Framework 2 (CIF 2) submission.

Estates masterplanning work began in 2008, culminating in a Planning Brief for Northampton Square developed in conjunction with London Borough of Islington. The Borough Core Strategy and Area Action Plan for Bunhill & Clerkenwell policies also provide relevant planning context. The requirements of City University’s wider estate have been advanced alongside the development of the new University Vision and Strategic Plan during Autumn 2011 and Spring 2012. School plans have been carefully considered as well as the output of Thematic Groups focussing on Research, Education and the Student Experience.

City University estate at March 2012 – overview

City University London occupies in excess of 120,000 sqm of floor area across 24 buildings¹ at four main sites:

- Northampton Square - Main Campus
- Gray’s Inn - City Law School
- Bunhill Row - Cass Business School
- West Smithfield - School of Health Sciences – this building is set to be redeveloped in 2015.

¹. Note: The floor area of 120,000 sqm is an estimate and may vary depending on the final plans and adjustments made during the implementation phase.
Northampton Square contains the University’s corporate headquarters, most of its teaching space and nearly all central student services. The location has good travel links and general amenity for both students (such as proximity to halls) and staff. City University is acknowledged as one of the most important institutions in the south of Islington and has historical links with the City of London. It therefore makes sense to maximise the potential of this location, developing other sites only for good financial and geographical reasons.

Current major projects include the installation of a new Combined Cooling and Heating Plant (CCHP) and phase 2 of the Northampton Square Education Projects involving the first stage of relocation of our School of Health Sciences to the main University campus.
University Vision and aspirations

The overall impression given by the physical University about the values it holds and wishes to project to the outside world is vitally important. Given advances in digital learning and communication, questions concerning the nature of the physical manifestation for a University in the 21st Century are highly relevant to an institution about to make a step change in academic achievement.

A drive to increase research quality and the need to recruit and retain excellent academics and support their work cuts across the University spectrum and requires a shift of emphasis from an estate substantially geared towards mass undergraduate teaching. Library, innovative educational environments and a sense of place that match City University’s ranking aspirations are high priorities but cannot be created overnight.

On a more philosophical level we are concerned with the nature of learning and its place in our society. Universities must allow the imagination and intellect to soar, therefore the creation of a special environment where people feel safe, part of a community and able to exchange ideas and thoughts should be a primary aim of our University Estates Strategy.

Academic excellence and growth in student numbers

A major challenge will be to deal with strategic legacy issues surrounding the School of Health Sciences (replacing lost premises), the City Law School (completing the work to provide a new home) and the School of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences (modernisation); while developing an estate that can support academic research work of the highest order. Our overcrowded main campus is set to become significantly busier year-on-year with approximately 1700 more students by 2016/17. There is a pressing need to ease circulation and provide more amenity if NSS and other student satisfaction measures are to be improved. At the same time it will become increasingly more difficult to develop study and library space on our main site.

The current main library has been developed mainly from expediency to provide a ‘functional zone’ both for study and for housing book collections. In recent years more relaxed and incredibly well used ‘social study’ areas have been provided. However, we will need much more quiet or silent study facility. It remains a strategic limitation that the University does not have a purpose-designed library facility of the sort that is more commonly associated with an institution of the academic standing to which City University aspires. Library design has to consider not just shelves and desk space, but also more complex issues. These include volumetric relationships, careful handling of circulation and the integration of technology which
can all play a vital role in creating a space that can inspire original thinking, orchestrate collaboration and enable access to a wide range of materials and support.

**New educational and library space to support higher level studies (including PhD research) will be required in addition to general teaching and communal facilities to meet growth in student numbers.**

## School level

The planning inputs from the Schools have common features which impact on the areas covered in this section.

### Centrally managed teaching space

Timetabling at City University is well developed and for the most part managed centrally with School-specific staff deployed according to teaching needs. Cass Business School has joined the rest of the University in Full Scheduling and much work is currently in progress to rationalise and harmonise the School of Health Sciences timetable as more and more of its activity switches to Northampton Square.

Projected student numbers vary across Schools but significant increases are envisaged for both Law and Cass Business School undergraduates and for postgraduates in most Schools. There is a weakening of demand forecast for 2012/13 as undergraduate tuition fee changes are felt, but Law and Cass Business School have increased their intake targets to compensate for this. This will place further strain on our larger lecture theatres as whole cohorts come together to be taught.

A preliminary analysis of future teaching capacity demands has been made on the basis of detailed information supplied by the Schools. Modelling is complex and the ability to support demand will also be affected by the development of teaching styles, potential rationalisation of modules and pathways, and academic discipline. Provision of new teaching capacity is critical to the success of the University’s Strategic Plan and priority should be given to creating space for this purpose.

*The figures suggest that demand can be supported with the addition of some smaller seminar rooms until 2014, when a larger 250 seat lecture theatre will be required. Further rooms will be needed in 2014/15 and in 2015/16.*
Academic staff facilities

The University-wide strategic initiative to increase research-active and research-excellent academic staff will have space and facilities consequences for all Schools. However, the impact will vary depending on the number involved, time taken to reach steady state and, to a large extent, the nature of existing accommodation. Some new academics will bring research teams which may potentially require new technical facilities, the nature of which may not be understood until late in the recruitment cycle. Our plans must accommodate this uncertainty in staff numbers.

*We will provide physical space appropriate to recruit and retain excellent academic staff, including offices and associated team facilities.*

PhD student facilities

The current strategic approach is to provide PhD facilities including shared office/desk space plus collaboration, meeting and social areas, within each School demise.

Cass Business School

The number of students in Cass Undergraduate Business School is planned to expand, with the change starting to have a significant impact in 2013/14. New high quality premises are required near to Bunhill Row to house Cass Executive Education and other corporate-facing activities, which might allow rationalisation of the Chiswell Street properties.

Arts (SoA)

Expansion of Journalism into the area currently occupied by CPE in College Building Ground floor has been requested. Relocating those activities to College Building Lower Ground would displace Development & Alumni.

Engineering & Mathematical Sciences (SEMS)

The School operates from poor quality, inefficient space within Tait Building, which impairs its ability to recruit and retain research-excellent academic staff. Its technical facilities are a selling point over some competitors and should be developed as such. Studies carried out in recent years suggest there are realistic opportunities to create first class space and to rationalise by exploiting the disused undercroft, admitting daylight into the centre of the building and introducing new mezzanine space. Incoming academics will bring post-doctoral research groups requiring new technical facilities.
Health Sciences (SHS)

By the summer of 2012 all activity will reside at Northampton Square or West Smithfield sites. Staff accommodation, support facilities and teaching activities will need to relocate from West Smithfield by November 2014 on expiry of City’s short term lease there.

Opportunities to further rationalise SHS accommodation should be explored alongside the general aim of consolidating all activity at Northampton Square.

City Law School

Current layouts for City Law School (CLS) to be accommodated within CIC building will not provide enough space for staff and PhD students, which could usefully be provided for in adjacent Gloucester Building if a new lease is secured.

Short term pressures may be alleviated through minor alterations and improvements to Gray's Inn Place.

Informatics

Changes in academic staff will likely be accommodated within existing space (assuming the return of room A306 for example). The potential exists for PhD students to share space with SEMS.

Elsewhere, opportunities to invest in incubator type space should be progressed where there is academic fit and location advantage eg Silicon Roundabout.

Social Sciences

Some rationalisation of current space to accommodate staff arriving in 2012 is required. Towards 2013/14 new testing facilities, laboratory and support space are needed as well as communal space for PhD students. The preferred solution for the School is to expand into other areas of Social Science building, which will require alternative premises to be made available for displaced functions.
Estates issues and opportunities

Overall composition of the estate/Tenure

General market conditions and specific timing of lease breaks/ expiry have opened up new opportunities to release dysfunctional premises and consolidate activity on our main University site where economies can be achieved. In summer 2012 we will occupy new leased premises at Myddelton Street for a minimum of 10 years.

In the short term the University should continue to divest itself of outlying leasehold premises where possible and make alternative arrangements to replace lost facilities at the West Smithfield and Whitechapel hospital sites. Previous studies have considered how the Optometry activities at Bath St could be consolidated with other SHS functions at Northampton Square and the potential sale of this property should be pursued.

We will continue to focus activity on Northampton Square and dispose of outlying buildings where they do not present significant locational advantages. We will explore and find ways of better using the freehold space that we own, maximising the asset value of the estate and reduce our reliance on leasehold space except for compelling locational and financial reasons.

Residential accommodation

Following a strategic decision made by Council in 2006 to withdraw from direct provision of residential accommodation the last of City University’s Halls (Finsbury, Heyworth and Peartree Court) are currently being sold for redevelopment. The scheme was granted consent in December 2011 and the completed scheme will deliver 2500 sqm of new academic space and an enlarged sports facility including a 6 badminton court, regional championship standard hall. The University should continue to develop its support for students seeking accommodation, through its network of third party nomination agreements and relationships with private landlords.

The new premises at Finsbury Hall site are an exciting opportunity to pursue academic objectives through the development of purpose-built, self-contained facilities adjacent to excellent sports, fitness and residential accommodation.

Development and Investment Potential

The University main campus consists of freehold land in Central London, with clear development potential recognised by the Local Authority and a chance to rid the estate of poorly functioning outlying leased properties. It makes little economic sense to pay rent on unsatisfactory premises while we
have under-utilised space and it is not really feasible to convert leased (office) accommodation to proper teaching rooms of any size for more than emergency use, at great expense. It is also undesirable from a pedagogical perspective. We should develop such functions on our own land zoned for D1 (Educational) use and near to central University functions. Support functions can be housed in secondary space. The Northampton Square Education Projects have in large measure utilised most of the remaining above-ground campus spaces capable of redevelopment. The plans from the Schools (without exception), request additional space. The only existing space potentially available for new teaching areas is at lower ground level.

The new academic space being developed at the former Finsbury residences (above) provides an opportunity for the University to house relatively self-contained facilities with proximity to excellent residential and leisure amenities. This could suit a collaborative venture with an external partner, or potentially house our INTO joint venture – subject to core teaching capacity needs being met elsewhere.

Therefore, the creation of any new, high quality University facilities is likely to require the development of one of the sites identified in the Northampton Square Planning Brief – see page 15.

As far as individual buildings are concerned, the Grade II listed College Building is a major asset; but University, Drysdale and Tait buildings also offer sound structures with reasonable floor to floor heights/grid spacing and are capable of sustaining a high level of alteration (subject to logistical constraints). It makes economic sense to alter and re-use these buildings. The architectural integrity of our newer buildings such as Social Science Building and Cass Business School at Bunhill Row should be preserved.

Drysdale Building is in need of improvement at Ground level which in turn depends on some forward thinking around the whole issue of ‘pc labs’ and innovative learning environments. Both this and University Building have seen various alterations over recent years but opportunities should be taken to continue to address or eradicate campus issues identified in the masterplan investigations.

The next major focus for redevelopment should be Tait Building. At over 20,000 sq m gross area it contains a substantial element of the main campus teaching provision, with large volumes at basement level not available anywhere else. It currently suffers from a major lack of environmental conditioning, noise transfer issues and a very leaky basement. Significant new services infrastructure is required and the central courtyard is unusable and wasteful.

Tait building must be considered a major under-utilised resource, whose reorganisation could provoke a number of opportunities to improve the main campus, acknowledging the infrastructure and logistical issues that have to be addressed.
Space management and utilisation

HEFCE compares the actual estate with a forecast model as part of the CIF2 metrics. The latest assessment\(^2\) indicates that City University’s estate is \textbf{86.6\%} of the size predicted which means that our space efficiency is high, while our gross internal space per student is \textbf{7.6 sq m} being higher than the 25\% percentile. These statistics indicate that formal learning spaces are provided at the expense of communal amenity areas.

City has a Space Management Group (SMG) in line with HEFCE best practice, whose primary purpose is to achieve the most appropriate use of space as a resource to be used to further the University strategic objectives. The group meets quarterly and reports to UET/ExCo. City has a Space Policy which is reviewed annually by SMG and sets out the ways in which space should be managed and allocated.\(^3\)

Space is actively managed through audits overseen by Property & Facilities but using student resource. The results are fed back into our space management database which is used to inform EMS (Estate Management Statistics) and TRAC returns as well as being used operationally for space planning. Our bi-annual teaching space survey and the resulting report is produced in accordance with the National Audit Office ‘Space Management in Higher Education – A Good Practice Guide’.

Teaching space – our actual utilisation 2010/11 rate is up at \textbf{30.0\%} from 25.7\% in 2008/9. Note that Utilisation rates are expressed as the multiplication of Frequency (the number of hours the space is in use compared with overall timetabled available time) by the Occupation (number of occupants compared with total capacity). In other words a Utilisation of 30\% does not mean our rooms are empty 70\% of the time and in fact would be considered as respectable in the sector with our planned (as opposed to actual) utilisation at 46\%. Further improvements are possible through behavioural changes in the way courses are delivered.

This progress has resulted from increased frequency while the occupancy rate has remained relatively steady. This indicates that our rooms are used on a greater number of occasions while group sizes remain consistent. The main issues affecting utilisation are:

- School discipline in forecasting numbers, making changes, eliminating local constraints;
- Rationalisation of programme pathways and module numbers;
- Availability and upkeep of AV equipment in teaching rooms.

\textit{We will continue to work with Schools to make best use of teaching and other space, recognising that the University must provide more amenity space for the whole University community.}
**Functional suitability**

Functional suitability is measured as the ability of University spaces to support the functions for which they are being used. Space is graded (to EMS rules) as 1, 2, 3, or 4. Grades 1 (Excellent) and 2 (Good) are essentially fit for purpose, however this measure is necessarily one-dimensional and takes little account of competitiveness, brand or image.

From 2008/09 onwards the submission has been carried out using the Estates Management Statistics Data Definition for Functional Suitability, which uses an element based approach for assessment purposes. With current projects space in grades 1 or 2 is set to rise to 98% with no grade 4 space for reporting year 2011/12. The University now no longer directly provides residential accommodation and this will not be reported on in future.

Some analysis was carried out in 2010 by IPD Occupiers engaged by HEFCE in relation to EMS data. The adjacent graph indicates where City lies (red column) in the sector in terms of increase in Functional Suitability over the last 10 years. This position is very encouraging and testament to the sustained effort to improve, upgrade and maintain to a high standard the whole estate.

**Building and services infrastructure condition**

The condition of the University estate is assessed through regular condition surveys and feedback from Students, Schools and Departments. Condition is graded from A to D in line with HEFCE Estates Management Statistics (EMS) rules, with A and B being in as new or very good condition, C representing areas which need refurbishment and D being unusable.

Figures for non-residential space in 10/11 are: 26% Grade A, 44% Grade B, 30% Grade C and 0% Grade D.

Through refurbishment of major areas and as a result of current projects by 2012/13 we will have achieved 74% of space at Grades A and B and 26% at Grade C. A new condition survey was completed in 2011 and this will inform the planning of refurbishment work.
1: KEY DRIVERS

**Energy and Environmental performance**

Energy consumption and carbon emissions have been driven down at City over the last five years thanks to the efforts of our Energy and Environmental Team. The University’s recently published Annual Sustainability Report provides a comprehensive view of City’s current position and shows carbon emissions of 9,989 tonnes in 2010/11, a reduction of 22% against the 2005/06 baseline. In 2011, City was the top London University and 155th out of 2000 businesses ranked in the published government Carbon Reduction Commitment Energy Efficiency Scheme. The University’s Carbon Management Plan was approved by Council in 2011, which describes how the University will meet UK Government commitments.

City has recently gained EcoCampus Gold accreditation and is on track for a Platinum award later in 2012.

*For reputational, ethical and corporate social responsibility reasons, not to mention good financial sense the University should embed existing targets for carbon reduction and encourage the widening application of sustainable principles throughout its operations.*

**Energy use – specific buildings:** Our buildings Display Energy Certificates (DECs) and the majority of City University buildings score above the typical benchmark (D: 76 – 100 rating) with Gray’s Inn Place, Bath St, Atkin at grade E. Cass Business School performance has been increased to F, but an increase in the number of occupants and extended opening hours have contributed to poor electrical performance. This is a common theme and a number of projects have been identified to improve performance and mitigate this effect.

*Targets to bring all buildings up to a minimum standard of energy use will be set through projects delivered as part of the LTM programme as well as initiatives to support required behaviours.*

Finally, while City has a distinguished record in the reduction of so-called Scope 1 and 2 emissions (relating to fossil fuels through utility use) it is arguably beginning to lag behind in terms of Scope 3 which relates to green procurement, travel and other factors across the spectrum of University activity. UET and ExCo have recently approved a restructure of the University Sustainability Group which is designed to further embed green thinking and behaviours within the wider University decision-making processes.
Northampton Square Masterplanning and Planning Brief

Commencing in 2007 a major piece of work was initiated which looked intensively at the existing main campus while consulting widely with staff and students about what worked and what did not.

The output of this exercise fed into the creation of a formal Planning Brief in conjunction with London Borough of Islington (see earlier)\(^7\), which will be used as Supplementary Planning Guidance in the determination of any Detailed Planning Applications.

The work is too extensive to summarise here but a number of key issues were identified that impair the campus. Since then, a number of summer projects have been executed to deal with urgent issues, leaving fundamental problems to be addressed by this strategy as follows:

- General agreement that the buildings are drab, with much space not fit for purpose in light of modern teaching methods and student expectations on entering tertiary education;
- Inherent architectural deficiencies of poor access and circulation, connectivity and engagement at street level, presenting barriers to building users, visitors and neighbours. These issues are becoming ever more important from a reputational perspective given increasing awareness and concern over corporate and social responsibility from our many stakeholders;
- Legacy issues of ad hoc planning and intervention leading to problems of zoning and space efficiency which manifest in servicing and wayfinding issues;
- Limited horizontal circulation or connection between buildings at anything other than Level 1 giving rise to pinch points and peak loading issues on staircases which will be increased as more students attend the Northampton Square site;
- Boundaries are invariably impermeable and disconnected from the local townscape. This is more than an urban design issue in that it fails to recognise the importance of the interface between University and its context. Whilst the creation of a cloistered oasis for serious study within a busy city may be appropriate and desirable, a defended citadel is arguably not and misses vital opportunities to engage and showcase the University’s achievements.
Development sites identified in the Northampton Square Planning Brief:

1. **Sebastian Street site** – inhabited by poor buildings and characterised by gross under-utilisation. It occupies a significant corner on Goswell Road and in doing so falls within the Northampton Square Conservation Area and any redevelopment proposal needs care in its conception and delivery. It is well related to the rest of the University but physically separate and requires significant new infrastructure (such as a new High Voltage electrical substation) to support any new building. It is also subject to various Rights to Light and Party Wall issues. This site conceivably has external value however it would be prudent for the University to retain the freehold for the long term.

2. **Centenary site** – another important corner site that is currently an eyesore both because of the open car park/garages it contains as well as the almost universally disliked Centenary building which also exhibits dreadful space use (net:gross ratio) owing to its conversion from a High Voltage electrical lab. It does however house four of the University’s largest and most intensively used lecture theatres and redevelopment is effectively blocked until that activity can be relocated.

3. **Student Union site** – a poor use of site, with an ugly semi-industrial steel cladding and a particularly dysfunctional half-floor level difference to the rest of the main site. This area was previously considered to have best potential for new premises, but the timing of current space and teaching demands now rules out a complete redevelopment.

*Outputs from the NSQ Masterplan investigations should inform future campus development if the architectural integrity is to be restored and the spaces work together as a unified entity.*

**Urban presence**

A logical extension to the campus masterplan investigations was carried out in summer 2011 which considered the extent to which the university is making sufficient use of its local context, both for practical wayfinding reasons and from a reputational perspective. A number of potential interventions have been discussed at senior level and should be considered alongside the Masterplan objectives.

*We will implement a range of local interventions designed over time, to create a ‘University Quarter’ at the City Fringe.*
Architectural appraisal – main campus

The original 1960s design by Sheppard Robson is considered by the 20th Century Society to have compositional merit, but has been defaced through successive insensitive alterations and additions. In the context of both contemporary design and perhaps a greater regard for our built heritage the main buildings may be perceived as drab, ugly and by extension ill-performing but given significant levels of under-investment over the decades one might argue they have lasted exceptionally well.

But perhaps the most disturbing aspect of our campus is that the original planning logic has been abandoned over the years and follows an ad-hoc and pragmatic course of converting disparate areas for various purposes with little thought to an overall development plan or indeed the original philosophy. This has often been at the expense of common areas which were naively considered to be of little value although as above, this has been mitigated to an extent by various recent summer projects. The central organising element of University Building originally conceived as the cultural heart of the University however, has been lost.

University Building had been deliberately designed as the centre piece of the new composition, elevated on piloti above an open concourse which allowed the majestic space of Northampton Square to flow into the campus and establish a symbiotic relationship between the two. Ascending the building, cultural facilities (common rooms, a hall with stage etc.) were provided which overlook the square, with elegant spiral staircases linking different floor levels. These areas now form the main library which involved the creation of an alternative and somewhat mean circulation system by which a full appreciation of this imposing building on the square has been lost. Recent years have seen some piecemeal investment as a stop-gap measure to address more immediate undergraduate social study demands but the library in total arguably falls short of the facility that might be expected from an institution with greater academic reputation, both in functional and representational terms.

The result is that the University no longer has a communal centre – with limited staff facilities and most importantly a lack of destination which tends to reinforce negative perceptions of a ‘commuter’ institution where education is seen as something you fit in between other things rather than one’s life’s work; or indeed the most intensive education experience that many students will enjoy in their lives. Unfortunately, this is likely to become more pronounced as Health students relocate to NSQ and new academics join with their teams and associated expectations – unless the opportunity is now taken to address some fundamental issues.
STRATEGIC AIMS

... by creating:

A new, world class educational building on Sebastian Street

Focused on graduate and research activities, including spaces for:

- First rate library and research
- Quiet and reflective study
- Collaboration, seminar and break-out space suitable for academic conferences
- Live/work/study spaces for international and other visiting academics
- Alumni and other International Development facilities

New UG and PG teaching space will be developed in the main campus lower ground areas and within Finsbury Academic Building subject to demand.

6500 sqm, open 2016

2: PROPOSALS

Provide high quality academic space
To meet the Vision of academic excellence

Re-create a sense of community and place
To improve our student experience

Support individual School plans
Which underpin the University’s future
Comprehensive new amenities for students and staff at Northampton Square

- New main entrance complex with associated meeting, catering, retail and exhibition facilities
- East-west circulation link at Level 1 to ease pressure on the existing main walkway, plus new or improved vertical circulation
- Communal facilities at Tait Level 1 around the redeveloped Courtyard, to provide areas for meeting, social study, dining, as well as space for clubs and societies. Staff facilities and break-out areas to support the Oliver Thompson Lecture Theatre could also be provided
- New Student Union bar, social space and offices fronting Goswell Road at Tait Building G Floor
- Projects designed to increase the University’s urban presence

Enhanced and expanded School facilities

**Arts** – further expansion and enhancement of facilities within College Building

**Cass** – new Executive Education premises in the City of London; redevelopment of Drysdale Level 3 to support Cass Business School Undergraduate plans plus further expansion within Drysdale if required

**Engineering & Mathematical Sciences** – complete overhaul of existing accommodation to provide modern, exciting and reputation-enhancing academic and technical space within lower Tait

**Health** – new staff accommodation within redeveloped Gloucester Building; new areas for clinics with public access along Tait G Floor fronting Ashby Street; potential further consolidation within upper Tait Building with a view to this ultimately housing all of Health Sciences (if the building is extended).

**Informatics** – improvements to existing accommodation in College Building and exploration of incubator space

**Law** – new HQ within CIC building, plus new staff and PhD facilities in redeveloped Gloucester Building

**Social Sciences** – development of new academic facilities within Social Science Building
A number of alternative approaches were considered, including:

New-build facilities on main campus?

There is insufficient time now to develop a new building on the main site that could meet current demands.

UG facilities on Sebastian Street site?

Enhanced and expanded student facilities are required urgently on our main site and include works to improve circulation and other structural issues such as accessibility. The Sebastian Street site is extremely sensitive to neighbouring residents and is not suited for use by large numbers of students entering and leaving the premises to use ‘central’ University amenities.

PG focused facilities on main campus?

These will continue to be provided within Schools and new communal facilities are intended for use by the whole University community. However, the opportunities to create suitable, high quality space for quiet and reflective study are compromised by how busy the main campus is becoming.

Alternatives to teaching space proposals?

The basement areas and Finsbury new academic space are the only areas currently available in which to develop new teaching space.

Leased or other premises?

Leasehold premises of the size and/or nature that might lend themselves to the kind of space the University needs generally do not exist in this part of Islington, which is primarily residential. Landlords owning office buildings are less keen on a D1 planning use particularly where premises are shared. Buildings designed for office use generally lack the structural grid or floor to floor dimensions that are required for such volumes and rarely have services capacity to deal with a transient student population. City owns under-developed freehold land in Central London.
Flexibility

The extent to which the overall plan can accommodate changes forced by circumstances or if plans don’t materialise:

Essential projects include those to relocate remaining SHS activity to Northampton Square, to fully establish CLS in new premises and to deal with legacy issues around SEMS space in Tait Building.

To secure these objectives we will need to develop new staff offices, support space, teaching and clinical skills areas. The proposal is to try and acquire a new long term lease in our Gloucester Building – likely to be a minimum 10 year term if reasonable rent is to be secured. Modernisation and consolidation of SEMS space will require the long term redevelopment of Tait Building to be commenced without delay.

Plans to increase teaching capacity could be scaled back if planned growth in student numbers is threatened. Please note that an increase in larger cohort group teaching is already set to flow through the system due to increased numbers sanctioned for Law and Cass UG, which require big cohort teaching. Any reduction in planned capacity expansion will require cut back in numbers and/or adoption of different teaching patterns.

Amenity areas and circulation improvements to support increased student numbers at our main campus are essential but could be scaled back to a certain degree.

Individual School plans projects can to some extent be cut back but many require up-front investment to realise academic and financial targets. Cass plans in particular require significant investment where any reversal would be costly.

New educational facilities at Sebastian Street will take the longest to procure with final funding authorisation not required until late 2013 at the very earliest. This could be deferred further subject to planning restrictions and market considerations.
### Investment Timeline

#### Essential spend: necessary regardless of implementation of plan
- Long term maintenance programme: £19M
- Expansion of educational space in NSQ: £6M

#### Foundations for Vision
- Cass: space for UG and Executive Education: £5.5M
- Cass Bunhill Row improvements: £2.0M
- Urban Presence: £2.0M
- Tait Ground floor: £7.5M
- Social Sciences space and refectory: £3.2M
- Main entrance and circulation space: £9.5M
- Tait Level 1: £8.0M

#### Vision
- New build (Sebastian Street): £35.2M

---

Commitment points. Not all spend will occur in year but be spread out over subsequent years.

Increasing knowledge of plan success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£M</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£31.5M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£M</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£25.0M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£M</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.5M</td>
<td>10.2M</td>
<td>46.2M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£73.0M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The University should continue and complete the transformation of Tait Building.

By extending upward by 2 storeys (as envisaged in the Planning Brief) it may be possible to consolidate all SHS activity within Tait building and relocate Professional Services there too, releasing 1 Myddelton Street premises at the 10 year break. Other focus areas for redevelopment in 5 – 10 years’ time are Refectory building and continued rationalisation of our outlying properties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key risks</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Definition</strong></td>
<td>The risk that business cases for specific projects take longer to form or approve, impacting the delivery timeline</td>
<td>University senior management have accepted the proposed timelines and a suitable governance structure by which to develop, challenge and rigorously test new business cases should be implemented. Early discussion and direction on new educational and library requirements are critically important to achieving academic goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination and disruption</strong></td>
<td>The complexity of sequencing all works so that normal business activities are not unduly affected</td>
<td>Property &amp; Facilities operates a well developed system of planning, coordination and communication of complex, interrelated projects requiring temporary decants and work within live buildings. Extensive stakeholder consultation is undertaken so that plans account for important University events (exams, Open Days) and general teaching. Alternative premises may be required at times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning permissions</strong></td>
<td>Delay or failure to achieve formal consents</td>
<td>The programmes are in accordance with the approved Planning Brief. Early and continuous consultation with LB Islington will be required and a dialogue developed at the highest level between City and the Borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability of premises</strong></td>
<td>Specific risks around the availability of project areas for teaching expansion (Drysdale Lower Ground or Finsbury academic space) or staff accommodation (Gloucester Building)</td>
<td>University senior management will need to determine and lead on overall priorities as appropriate to achieve core outputs. Core teaching capacity must be given high priority or student programme targets cut back accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to School Plans and/or external context</strong></td>
<td>Sector and/or market expectations do not materialise or are markedly different. Also where precise requirements for incoming academic staff (eg research facilities for associated teams) may not be known before they are recruited</td>
<td>The plan offers degrees of flexibility as above. Legacy issues dictate that a minimum of activity will have to be delivered to support growth in numbers and to address loss of leased premises. The programme demands early commitment to projects however.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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