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1 • Executive summary

This document is intended to support the University’s aspirations for the next ten years. It has been prepared with close reference to the strategic framework and other University policies and further informed by interviews with staff from across the institution.

Drawing on these, the main objective for the estate is to create a high quality built environment which is financially and environmentally sustainable and which supports teaching and research of the highest standards, is attractive to students and staff and promotes a positive image of the University.

In assessing all of the influences on the estate, there are some clear and dominating themes and these are expressed as our top 10 priorities in Section 4.

The first three priorities relate to condition, space and environment. These are our chosen Estates KPIs, and as such will be subjected to regular performance assessment.

The top priority is to maintain the campus to the highest possible standard by bringing the older buildings up to the quality of the new buildings and maintaining that quality over the long term.

The second priority promotes environmental sustainability. We need to build on recent foundations by achieving the targets we have set ourselves and by implementing our environmental policy. Our attitude to this priority is closely linked to our future wellbeing and prosperity.

The last of our KPIs relates to using our space more effectively. Our challenge here is to achieve continued efficiency gains in the way we utilise space, thereby ensuring best value from continued investment in the estate.

The remaining priorities relate to providing best value across all estates activities; providing efficient facilities management; complying with statutory legislation; preserving and adding to the attractiveness of the city campus; promoting further the profile of the University in its city context; providing a safe and secure campus environment and finally raising the profile of the estate within the University’s strategic agenda.

A view from the 2001 ‘Campus in the City’ vision contrasted with the actual campus in 2007
1.1 Introduction and main themes

In this section we summarise the main themes of the strategy.

Introduction

Visitors to the city campus frequently comment on its fine location and the high quality of the estate. The consultation exercise for this strategy confirmed that this is also a view held by many of the people who work there, acknowledging the huge improvements that the campus has seen recently.

We are located near the centre of an ambitious, forward-looking city, which too has seen enormous progress in recent years. We are fortunate to have what many consider to be a first class campus, and this strategy seeks to show how we can build upon our strengths by further consolidating and improving the quality of the estate.

Strategy process

The process used in defining this strategy is consistent with the approach recommended in Scottish Funding Council guidance. We started by looking at the major influences on the estate, principally derived from our strategic framework but also using the outputs from an extensive consultation exercise. These influences are then translated into a series of ten priorities. The ways in which the University’s Estates & Buildings department will support implementation of these priorities is then outlined in section 5, the Vision to 2018.

Finally, the strategy defines a small number of measurable key performance indicators, against which our progress can be judged.

Theme

Adaptability is a recurrent theme in this strategy. Our buildings, and the spaces within them, need to be increasingly multi-functional if we are to achieve the most intensive use of our resources and to meet the needs of the University as a dynamic learning environment. Similarly, professional support staff in the estate department and related services need to be adaptable and flexible to meet the varying demands that are made on them.

Scope

The strategy is intended to cover the next 10 years but it will be regularly updated to reflect the dynamic environment of the University. It will bring our existing strategy up to date by addressing contemporary demands and focus on the need for our estate to provide the platform for our teaching and research ambitions in the future. The strategy also aspires to place the University of Dundee in its city context.
Progress to date

In the last five years, we have transformed much of the city campus into one we can be rightly proud of. We have invested over £200m in the development of new and refurbished learning and teaching space, research accommodation, and residential, sport and social facilities. Seven of our historic buildings on the Geddes Quadrangle and College Green have been given a new lease of life with contemporary interiors and extensive statutory compliance works. This work was envisaged in the last estate strategy (2003), the priorities of which were to create sustainable, fit for purpose, attractive, effective and intensively used accommodation. This supported the University’s commitment to achieving excellence in learning and teaching, promoting pure and applied research and scholarship at international levels of excellence and enabling staff and students to develop to their full potential in an environment of equal opportunity.

The 2003 aims have guided the University through an unprecedented period of growth, which has seen the creation of many new buildings and a start made to creating a “green” heart for the city campus.

Achieving quality and attractiveness in our new builds, the spaces between them and in our major refurbishments has always been a priority. We will seek to build on this base by continuing to employ the best designers and contractors and control their work with a continuous process of design review. To this end, we will continue to review our major new capital proposals through a Design Review Group, chaired by the Convenor of the Campus Services Committee.

While the 2003 aims are still important, today there is also a new and growing emphasis on environmental issues, the maintenance backlog and our overall financial sustainability.

Options appraisals

For several years we have employed a tested system for developing building options appraisals ensuring that alternative routes are fully explored before we commit to a particular building solution. In addition, since 2002 we have used an approved in-house system for appraising investment decisions before we invest in significant capital works. These processes, and some proposed refinements, are described in more detail in section 5, Managing the Estate.

There are two significant future projects that will require careful consideration and the application of these processes. The first concerns the future of the Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design and whether to remain on the existing site in redeveloped accommodation or to move to customised new-build facilities. The second relates to University accommodation at Ninewells and whether to refurbish or relocate the laboratory block activities.
Possible vision of Smalls Wynd seen from the north
Effective space management is becoming increasingly important. Whilst we do not yet have robust utilisation data for the whole campus, the preliminary work that has been carried out suggests that, as an institution, there is considerable scope for improvement. The 2007/08 EMS return of 16% utilisation rate for timetabled rooms based upon physical utilisation surveys, is categorised as ‘poor’ in SFC guidelines. Our objectives are to carry out regular surveys of all accommodation, to improve the accuracy of our data, to develop space standards (norms) within the period of the strategy and to reach a 30% utilisation rate target by 2012. We will look closely at the current profile of space and occupancy rates across the University, plan more accurately for future space needs and make more intensive use of our existing space.

Building condition

Our 2007 condition survey revealed that many of our buildings and the associated infrastructure are in poor condition, requiring substantial investment to repair or upgrade them to a sound condition. Investment in the order of £46m is required to bring our buildings up to, and maintain them at, RICS condition grade B. A recommended 10 year cost analysis plan has been provided by Drake and Kanneymeyer but we will require to develop our own investment plan taking into account the available financial and human resources.

Environmental

Environmental issues now feature significantly in the University’s strategic agenda and we are conscious that our profile in this area is increasingly important to our staff, students and funders. Whilst our performance in some areas such as power generation is exemplary (we have received a Green Gown Award in each of the last two years), much work remains to be done across several areas including fair trade, green travel, energy, waste and awareness raising.
The most significant building projects for the coming years are likely to be:

1 • Ninewells
The combined effects of deteriorating infrastructure and the need for significant investment in both teaching and research facilities make Ninewells our most urgent priority for investment.

2 • Duncan of Jordanstone
Both the main Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design buildings (Matthew and Crawford) need extensive upgrading, and possibly wholesale replacement. In either event, very significant investment will be required.

3 • Life Sciences
For many years Life Sciences has been our highest profile activity, generating income and prestige for the whole University and city. This profile continues to grow and it is very likely that further expansion will happen in the vicinity of the existing complex.

4 • Significant refurbishments
Of the remaining city campus buildings, Scrymgeour (Law and Psychology) and Fulton (Engineering) are in greatest need of significant overhaul. Both buildings are scheduled to be retained for the longer term and contain key departments, so major investment will be needed during the period of this strategy.

The University is currently experiencing a challenging financial situation, with the operating position improving gradually over a five-year period. The drive to achieve financial sustainability is a constant theme running through this document.

The estimated costs of continuing to redevelop the campus amount to £140m over the next 10 years, of which about £46m relates to backlog maintenance. We plan to manage this within existing borrowing requirements and our approach to managing it is shown in Section 5.3.
2 • Background and influences

In this section we look at the major influences on the estate strategy.

2.1 The University of Dundee

...the objects of the University shall be to advance and diffuse knowledge, wisdom and understanding by teaching and research and by the example and influence of its corporate life.

(University Charter, 1967)

Our University Charter still defines the University’s mission today as it moves forward as one of the United Kingdom’s top institutions for teaching and research.

The laboratory-based medical and life sciences are 5* rated while the University is home to one of the UK’s top art and design schools.

The University offers a wide range of vocational degree programmes as well as traditional arts and science degree courses, which are informed by academic research across the disciplines. Dundee was Scottish University of the Year 2004/2005 (Sunday Times) and was ranked top university in the UK for teaching quality in 2005 (Times Higher Education Supplement).

The University continues to advance and has recently undertaken a major reorganization of the academic structure into 4 Colleges and 16 Schools.

The University is a powerful force in the physical transformation of Dundee. We are using the development of the city campus to encourage improvements to the wider urban environment. We engage with partners in various fora, including the Dundee Partnership, which aim to develop and improve the city.

We have an important synergistic relationship with NHS Tayside; strong working relationships with NHS Fife, Scottish Enterprise Tayside and Dundee City Council; and good educational links with the Universities of Abertay and St Andrews, and the colleges of further education in Perth, Angus, Fife and Dundee.
A more dynamic, entrepreneurial and internationally competitive Scotland, whose people are amongst the most skilled and educated of any of our competitors, and whose colleges and universities are world-class contributors to economic, social and cultural development."
2.2 Scottish Further & Higher Education Funding Council

**SFC issued the latest guidance notes for the preparation of estate strategies in July 2007.**

SFC’s corporate plan sets out its expectation of high standards of governance, leadership and management and a culture of continuous improvement in colleges and universities.

High quality buildings, facilities and equipment are a specific objective. This will be achieved by governing bodies including estate strategies in their institutional strategic planning and linking estates development appropriately with learning, teaching and research strategies.

The process used in defining the aims of the strategy is in line with the approach recommended in the SFC guidance.

2.3 The University’s financial position

**The University clearly acknowledges the importance of continuous investment in its estate. It is for this reason that the University has undertaken a number of actions focused on achieving a sustainable surplus to enable such investment.**

The University has set itself the target of achieving a sustainable 3% operating surplus over five years. This is essential, among other things, to enable the University to invest in its physical and technological infrastructure. During this period it is clear that the University has to manage its capital programme carefully, ensuring borrowing limits are observed, external funding is maximised and costs are controlled. The University will manage capital projects on a priority basis and therefore the emphasis in the short term will be on reducing the maintenance backlog.

In recent years the University has successfully attracted external financing as well as making strategic disposals, both of which have enabled the University to improve its estate significantly.

An essential part of the estate funding is the money the University receives in the form of SRIF and LTIF Funding. SRIF 2 & 3 provided the University with £22m and in the last two years we have received £10m in LTIF funding.

Continued, ring-fenced capital funding from SFC will be essential if we are to make further progress. We have forecasted £6m per annum based on an estimate of how the total capital budget may be distributed. This would equate to around 40% of the University’s capital programme funding requirements.

In addition to this we aim to raise an additional 20% through other sources of external funding, with charities being the most likely source.

This would leave around £6m per annum which the University will seek to generate through a combination of its operating cash flow and other strategic disposals. Over the last five years, we have addressed the major problem of our former outmoded and unattractive residences, and replaced them with modern, en-suited bed spaces as part of a contract which will ensure the long-term maintenance of the residences in accordance with a detailed schedule. Over the next year, we will continue to dispose of the remaining surplus residential properties, thereby releasing some £18m for reinvestment in the University’s estate. We will also continue the process of consolidation and help pay for further improvements by disposing of a small number of other properties that are surplus to our requirements. Such property is typically outwith, or on the periphery of, the main campus and is often unfit for purpose and expensive to maintain. By disposing of such property we will also reduce our maintenance costs and ultimately improve our intensity of space use.
2.4 Strategic framework

The University has recently published its strategic framework to 2012. That document recognises that the estate will play a major role in the future prosperity of the University.

The framework identifies seven University-wide strategic aims for the period to 2012, which are to:

1. Attract high-achieving students and those with high potential
2. Provide the best student experience
3. Increase postgraduate activity
4. Promote research excellence and profitable partnerships
5. Contribute to knowledge transfer and the development of Dundee and Scotland
6. Improve the responsiveness of support services
7. Ensure the University’s long term financial sustainability
Aims 1 to 5

Aims 1-5 are mainly concerned with the student experience and our estate strategy supports these academic aims by providing a sustainable, intensively used, fit-for-purpose, attractive and effective built environment. In particular, the estate strategy should enhance the experience of both undergraduate and postgraduate students by:

- Providing excellent support services, accommodation options, social facilities and a great environment for students in a responsive manner.

- Where possible, organising services to provide an integrated, student-centred approach. This may require proposals to be brought forward during the plan period for new accommodation, with interim arrangements in the shorter term.

- Continuing to improve residential, social and sports facilities for students of diverse ages and backgrounds.

- As resources allow, finalising and implementing the proposals for the “greening” of the city campus, recognising the importance of quality in spaces as well as buildings.

- Bringing forward proposals to satisfy the needs of postgraduate and mature students in general, particularly for study, social and living accommodation.
Aim 6 •

Aim 6 directly states the key objectives for the estate, which are to:

• Develop a responsive estate strategy, reflecting the University’s education, research and support strategies and college development proposals. Respond to the need to improve our infrastructure for postgraduate education.

• Pay increased attention to the implications of maintaining the estate to a high and sustainable standard.

• Contribute to environmental sustainability by developing and managing buildings, spaces and equipment efficiently. Consider ways to achieve a more intensive use of the estate through space planning and an awareness of new ways of working and learning. Ensure that the University uses energy carefully and promotes environmentally responsible practices at all levels by staff, students and visitors.

• Improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the in-house estate team and the management of external maintenance contracts with the aim of achieving better value for money.
Aim 7 •

Aim 7 is an overarching aim to achieve long-term financial sustainability. The estate strategy can make a positive contribution by ensuring that our spending on facilities, maintenance and capital is managed to the highest standards of efficiency and represents the best possible value for money. We will do this if we:

• Manage carefully the capital programme, ensuring borrowing limits are observed, external funding is maximised and costs are controlled. As resources allow, achieve a re-balancing of activities with an increased emphasis on long term maintenance and refurbishment works.

• Ensure that all physical assets – buildings, equipment and external spaces – are used efficiently throughout the year.

• Ensure that our financial and project management and business planning capacity is upgraded, as part of our overall staff development effort.
2.5 Consultation process and responses

Everyone on campus is affected by the estate and the buildings within it. It is important, therefore, that everyone is given an opportunity to contribute to a document that maps the future. Personal consultations were conducted with all key staff and influential players in the city and a web-based questionnaire was used to gauge opinions on the estate (see appendix 14).

The questions formed the basis of individual consultations and also a web based invitation to all staff and students. The top ranked challenges for the estate from the responses received were:

**Challenge 1 • Maintaining and managing the campus**

The majority of respondents thought the main challenges for Estates & Buildings is to sustain a cohesive main city campus which has diverse building styles and ages, to bring the older buildings up to the quality of the new buildings and maintain that quality, meeting the demands for architectural quality and of an historic environment.

**Challenge 2 • Environmental sustainability**

The area next seen as the most important challenge was environmental sustainability and need for a visible commitment to this. Whilst social and economic sustainability was also seen as important, most respondents were concerned about the carbon footprint of the University.

**Challenge 3 • Space management**

Creating appropriate accommodation and designing more flexible space were seen as commensurate in importance to creating environmental and financial sustainability and there is an evident link between them.

**Challenge 4 • Estates administration**

It was felt by some that the improvement of policy, processes, communication and support activities were the biggest challenge for Estates & Buildings.

**Challenge 5 • Transport and parking**

A significant number of respondents noted a lack of parking at both the main city campus and Ninewells and a more “equitable” system as a main challenge for Estates & Buildings.

**Challenge 6 • Financial management**

Of major concern to several respondents was the ability to financially manage the cost of a diverse estate. It was noted that more investment is needed in meeting the minimum maintenance requirements in a period of tight finance and rising cost. Improving service provision with less money and providing high quality accommodation as the University expands were seen as major challenges.
Respondents were also asked about their opinions on the best and worst aspects of the campus:

"Overwhelmingly, the best aspect of the University is considered to be its location both in terms of the Tay and the City, green space and landscaping. Both the historic buildings and the quality of new buildings are appreciated as being highly attractive to students and staff with huge improvements taking place in the last three years. The quality of Estates staff was considered critical and staff were described as dedicated, friendly, helpful and loyal."
Respondents were also asked about their opinions on the best and worst aspects of the campus:

Best aspects

Overwhelmingly, the best aspect of the University is considered to be its location both in terms of the Tay and the city, green space and landscaping. Both the historic buildings and the quality of new buildings are appreciated as being highly attractive to students and staff with huge improvements taking place in the last three years. The quality of Estates staff was considered critical by many respondents and staff were described as dedicated, friendly, helpful and loyal. The compact city campus was also felt to be an outstanding feature.

Worst aspects

The worst aspect of the University was considered to be the need for additional investment to bring the entire campuses up to first class standard and to maintain that standard over the long term.

A summary of individual responses from personal consultations, and to the online questionnaire which was open to all staff and students, is available online at: www.dundee.ac.uk/estates/management/annualreport/strategy.htm
2.6 Dundee city local plan 2005

The city benefits from having two universities and will broadly support their future development:

Policy 28: Higher Education Development

The City Council will support further higher education development generally and particularly in association with relevant business and research expansion.

The University of Dundee contributes to the plan in three key areas - Economic, Environment and Experience - and these are clearly linked with the overall University strategic objectives:

1) Economic
   Attracting new people to the area and working with businesses in research and development.

2) Environment
   Ensuring that University strategy encourages future development of the University campus in an attractive and sustainable manner.

3) Experience
   Making the student experience as good as it can be.
2.7 Condition of the Estate

The city campus has a number of distinctive strengths. In particular, it is compact, well located, self-contained and relatively safe. Weaknesses include the legacy of 1960s and 1970s buildings that comprise the bulk of outstanding backlog maintenance requirements.

In July 2007 Estates & Buildings commissioned Drake & Kannemeyer, Chartered Surveyors, to carry out a comprehensive estate condition and statutory compliance appraisal of the University. This survey provides us with general guidance on the condition of each building, identifies significant works required to bring each building into compliance with current legislation and notes the order of costs for bringing the estate up to a sound condition.

The following Condition gradings were employed:

| Condition A | As new |
| Condition B | Sound, operationally safe and exhibits only minor deterioration |
| Condition C | Operational but major repair or replacement needed soon; reasonably foreseeable lack of compliance with legislation |
| Condition D | Inoperable or serious risk of failure or breakdown; lack of compliance with legislation or imminently dangerous breach |
| Condition DX | Lack of compliance with legislation or imminently dangerous breach observed by the surveyor or identified by the responsible authority who have issued a warning or directive requiring works to be carried out within a specified period |

It is estimated that works costing approximately £46m including fees and VAT, would be required to ensure that each building could be graded as at least Condition B.

These findings are reinforced by the recent Audit Scotland report on University estates which estimated our backlog at £60m. Our maintenance legacy is very extensive, although at a level that is reasonably consistent with the rest of the sector.

We have several very modern buildings on campus but the majority of the estate (77%) dates from pre 1980 and most of these buildings are showing signs of deterioration, functional obsolescence, under investment and consequent lack of maintenance.
The **Building Condition by Grading** chart highlights from the £46m overall spend required that 48% (£22m) is necessary to improve those buildings given a Condition C grading up to a Condition B grading.

A further 36% (£16.6m) is necessary to maintain those buildings given a Condition B grading at that level. The buildings given a Condition D grading require 14% (£6.5m) of the overall £46m required expenditure to bring them up to a Condition B grading.

We have several A-rated buildings following the recent intensive capital programme but these are excluded from this analysis for clarity.

The **Building Elements Risk Evaluation** chart identifies that the majority of building elements have been categorised as a safety-critical, significant risk equating to 54% (£24.8m) of the £46m overall spend required to reduce the risk to a non-critical level. In addition there is requirement to spend 45% (£20.7m) on building elements categorised as a moderate risk.
In terms of Statutory Compliance we are lacking in several areas. Fire safety elements and health & safety elements account for the largest percentage of the advised statutory compliance repair cost, being 69% (£4.1m); electrical safety elements account for 13% (£0.8m), while the final 14% (£1.1m) is split amongst various other items. These areas need to be addressed in the near future to reduce risk to the University.

The Element Condition Appraisal Costs chart and Element Statutory Compliance chart splits the overall required spend of £46m into individual elements. Element condition costs account for £40m, while element statutory compliance costs equate to £6m.

The Element Condition Appraisal Costs chart highlights the elements of our buildings which are most in need of attention, breaking down the overall required spend of £40m into individual elements. It can be seen from the chart that problems with the fabric of many of our buildings require to be addressed, with 51% (£20.1m) of the advised condition appraisal repair cost required for roof and fabric repairs. In addition, electrical and heating systems throughout many of the buildings require to be upgraded; each account for 18% (over £7m each), while the final 13% (£5.5m) is split amongst various other items.

In terms of Statutory Compliance we are lacking in several areas. Fire safety elements and health & safety elements account for the largest percentage of the advised statutory compliance repair cost, being 69% (£4.1m); electrical safety elements account for 13% (£0.8m), while the final 14% (£1.1m) is split amongst various other items. These areas need to be addressed in the near future to reduce risk to the University.
The overriding conclusions from the condition survey are that:

1. A significant proportion of our buildings and the associated infrastructure are in poor condition, requiring substantial investment to repair or upgrade them to a sound condition.

2. Many of the elements contained within our buildings are inoperable or at serious risk of failure or do not comply with legislation. In addition, in excess of 50% of the elements surveyed will require major repair or replacement soon.

3. Investment in the order of £40m is required to bring our buildings up to RICS Condition Grade B.

4. Investment in the order of £6m is required to bring our buildings into compliance with current legislation (excluding DDA requirements).

5. The fact that a building is recorded as suffering from various deficiencies does not necessarily mean that those deficiencies should be repaired. It may well be more sensible to change the use of the building, demolish or sell it depending on the wider University context.

6. The 10 year cost analysis plan provided in the condition survey reflects the current situation. We will require to develop our own investment plan taking into account the available financial and human resources.

Additional detail from the Condition and Statutory Compliance report is given in the appendices.
2.8 University Masterplans

The Strategic Framework requires that we:

“Deliver the masterplan for the main campus and develop one for Ninewells in partnership with NHS Tayside to act as stimuli to providing high quality buildings, spaces and connection as resources allow. Work with partners to develop Dundee’s Cultural Quarter, for example through the Rep / Bonar Hall / DCA / Sensation linkages.”

In 2001, the University, Dundee City Council and Scottish Enterprise Tayside commissioned a joint study entitled ‘The Campus in the City’. This document provided the framework for a more detailed study in 2005 conducted by Sir Terence Farrell and Partners which involved a much wider consultation exercise and yielded the current 20 Year Masterplan within which most of the significant future developments on campus are framed.

The existence of a Masterplan also allows integration into the wider city plan and smoother administrative dealings on planning matters.

More specific options appraisal exercises have been carried out on a number of sites around the campus and several more are planned including the significant Smalls Wynd development. These studies too will be guided by the Masterplan.

NHS Tayside is currently preparing a Masterplan document for the Ninewells site in collaboration with the University and this document will be completed in 2008.
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This section looks at the status and aspirations of the key components of the Estate, starting with some representational maps of the city campus:

3.1 City campus

The city campus contains approximately 60 buildings on an area of 174,000 sqm gross, accommodating 17,000 staff and students. It houses the bulk of our accommodation for teaching and research.
The following series of campus plans are designed to convey an impression of the current state of the city campus in relation to three principal measures:

1. The proportion of the estate that has been significantly rebuilt over the last two years
2. The proportion of the estate that has yet to be subjected to significant redevelopment
3. The proportion of the estate that will or has been recently disposed of

The fourth plan shows our parking strategy.

1 · City campus - recent major new builds and refurbishments

This image shows that a large proportion of the estate has been upgraded or rebuilt and particularly towards the northern boundary.
2 • City campus - future major refurbishments

Roughly as many of our major campus buildings remain to be refurbished as have been completed. Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design plus the Scrymgeour and Fulton buildings represent the largest individual challenges.
3 • City campus - disposals and demolitions

Disposals are all on the periphery of the city campus and only a few buildings will be demolished within the period of the strategy.
A significant conclusion from the University’s Masterplanning process was that we should aim to make the heart of the city campus a car free zone as soon as possible. Now that the Heathfield multi-storey car park is open (providing an additional 210 spaces) there is the opportunity in 2008 to close some of the central car parks where Phase 1 of the Campus Green is to be located. When the new Hunter Street car park is completed it is expected that most of the remaining spaces can finally be pedestrianised. Our Green Travel initiative with the City Council is focused on reducing car usage generally and our long term aim is to retain the numbers of University controlled spaces around the campus at present levels of about 1000 spaces. The process of pedestrianising the heart of the campus and removing cars to the perimeter harmonises well with this. See also appendix 10.
Perspective view from Ninewells Road of possible Biomedical Research Institute, alongside existing TMRC and CRC.
3.2 Ninewells Campus - status and aspirations

Ninewells is the major clinical facility and teaching hospital in Tayside and the University’s College of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing is based there. It has a population of just over 4000 staff and students and occupies accommodation in the order of 30,000m² of useable space.

The buildings on the site are almost all part of a pro indiviso agreement between NHS Tayside and the University, with the University owning just over 25%. Historically, the University has enjoyed a very good working relationship with NHS Tayside and we are currently collaborating with our NHS colleagues on the production of a strategic development plan for the site.

The infrastructure of the entire complex is now 40 years old and needs significant overhaul or replacement. Dealing with this while also improving the overall quality of teaching and learning space at Ninewells, represent the key objectives for this campus.

Additional college accommodation is located at the Dental School and Airlie Place on the city campus, Braeknowe and Taypark House and the MacKenzie building. Nursing accommodation is also located at the Kirkcaldy campus and the College has bases at Perth Royal Infirmary (PRI) and Stracathro Hospital. At PRI there are medical student placements, clinical skills teaching facilities, a library and an out-post of clinical research activity. Stracathro hosts medical student placements and clinical skills teaching. The facilities at Perth and Stracathro are generally administered by the NHS.

At Ninewells, there seems little sign of deceleration in requests for more sophisticated and specialised laboratory and patient related research accommodation. Demand is strong for both refurbishment and new accommodation.

The pressure on facilities at Ninewells and other hospital sites differs from the rest of the University in that the formal two semester teaching year is not recognised and the facilities are required to operate virtually all year.

Pro indiviso agreement

A pro indiviso agreement between the University and Trust has existed for many years and is a tested, flexible framework within which both the University and Trust should be able to fulfil their future aspirations. The agreement includes most of the original building with the exception of the nursing and laundry blocks. The agreement excludes areas outwith the original footprint. The University has no title to the land within Ninewells.

Currently, each extension of the footprint requires specific agreement with the Trust and, although a simple form of model agreement seems possible, the method of funding and Trust involvement will require a project-by-project solution.

The agreement is inherently sound but we need to investigate the options around pro indiviso for the future. For example, we could try to extend the pro indiviso agreement to capture new developments like the Translational Medicine Research Centre (TMRC) and the Clinical Research Centre (CRC) and any relevant remaining development sites.

In order to proceed, an agreement in principle is required at senior Trust and University levels on standard protocols for future use. The current Strategic Development Plan exercise could be utilised to guide such an agreement.
**Strategic Development**

Both the University and NHS Tayside have active and complementary development programmes.

The College of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing has a clear aspiration to prioritise new learning and teaching accommodation which will facilitate small group teaching – this is essential in order to satisfy GMC requirements for the teaching of medical students. This development will also pull together activities like the Centre for Medical Education and Distance Learning.

The University has embarked upon the construction of the CRC and TMRC, both of which cater for specific, non-teaching requirements. A new Biomedical Research Institute is identified as a possible next phase of extension to the east of the TMRC. This would create a suite of three, self-contained but linked buildings attached to the existing laboratory block.

The existing laboratory block has limited potential to satisfy future requirements for sophisticated laboratory space because of the lack of room for plant and service infrastructure. The relative distribution of University and Trust accommodation and the conflict of horizontal departmental configuration and vertical plant service distribution means wholesale replacement of infrastructure is not readily achievable, without major disruption to adjacent departments.

The construction of a new build Biomedical Research Institute (BRI) will be considered as part of a major options appraisal.

The School of Nursing & Midwifery requires a thorough assessment of existing accommodation and the current College review is considering the merits of consolidating activity on two campuses in Dundee and Fife.

The College review also identifies the Dental School on the city campus to be in need of significant refurbishment.

**Estates relationship with Trust**

At the estates operational level the University has enjoyed a good working relationship with the Trust for several years. This has been strengthened by our ability to discuss site-wide issues openly with NHS Tayside’s Director of Operations, the Director of Site Services and the Head of Estates.

**Strategic Development (Master) Plan**

Key to addressing the future development problems associated with newbuild proposals is the Strategic Development Plan and Currie & Brown have been commissioned to manage this work.

This exercise will eventually identify both the Trust’s and University’s future aspirations in terms of development footprints. It will not comment in detail on the lifespan of existing services and possible solutions to the longer term sustainability of the infrastructure. However, it should identify key areas which will warrant further, more detailed studies. These would become separate commissions for specialist consultants, carried out under the umbrella framework of the Strategic Development Plan.
Infrastructure issues

Whilst the structural fabric of the Ninewells estate is generally robust and flexible due to the concrete frame structure, the infrastructure needs a significant amount of work. The original plant is both under capacity for today’s demands and close to the end of its serviceable life. In an attempt to service major refurbishments both organisations have had no option but to install ad hoc service plant. This strategy has provided “selfish” solutions, occupying valuable plant/service space for individual projects, without contributing to the central services infrastructure. A joint strategy with the Trust is necessary to address this issue as there is a cost implication of many millions of pounds over several years to ensure a long term sustainable future.

Space management at Ninewells

The University and Trust have established a joint Space Utilisation Group to manage space at Ninewells.

The College has also recently established its own Space Advisory Group which mirrors the University-wide Space Management Group and all requests for additional space are now being considered in a more strategic manner.

The proposed University-wide space audit will help to evaluate the efficiency of space utilisation.

Maintenance cost sharing (hospital shared costs)

A number of agreements currently exist with the NHS Trust covering building maintenance and repairs, utilities, cleaning services, phones, postage, janitorial services, rent and others.

Many of these agreements are now out of date and have been subject to review for some time. In the past, and where appropriate, the area occupied has been used for simplicity as the main driver in setting the level of charge.

At present, the base space data is being updated and the conclusions of this exercise will carry implications for future charges.

The re-negotiation of the existing agreements will require involvement at the highest level of both organisations to debate the key issues.

3.3 Kirkcaldy Campus - status and aspirations

The University occupies 2,100sqm of useable space in Kirkcaldy – 1,730sqm in the teaching block and a further 370sqm in a residential block.

The site is owned by NHS Fife, but is maintained and serviced by the University Estates & Buildings department, which is also responsible for the provision of security, janitorial, cleaning and catering services.

Our main objective for the Kirkcaldy campus is to modify and improve the efficiency of the service provision and the future will involve further detailed discussions with NHS Fife and other partners to ensure that the estate best meets the needs of nursing education in Fife.
3.4 Grounds and gardens - status and aspirations

The Grounds and Gardens service consists of two elements - the management of the green space within the city campus and the management and promotion of the University Botanic Garden.

A green plan for the campus

Over the last five years the campus green space has changed considerably from large areas of grass and high numbers of trees to a more maintenance intensive layout which consists of many smaller, more distinct areas.

As these new areas are going through the establishment phase we are using the best horticultural techniques to ensure they grow to maturity.

Landscape plants do not have an indefinite life span. To ensure the continual development of the green space it is important to redevelop areas when the need and the opportunities arise. Alongside the many new planted areas there are plots that require redevelopment and we intend to work on these over the next few years.

Every opportunity will be taken to plant trees where possible and to accord a priority to developing a green plan for the campus that reflects its importance as a conservation area as designated by the City Council.

The Campus Green

At the heart of realising a high quality landscape within the campus we have an ambition to develop a new Campus Green. The consultation process shows that this is fully supported by the University community.

Ambitions for the Botanic Garden

The University started the Botanic Garden in 1971 on a 9.5 hectare site to the west of the main campus. The Garden is mature and forms an important area of green space for the city. It has notable collections of plants.

The Garden aims to provide a research, education and community resource for the University and the City of Dundee and as such is a key external face of the organisation. The University of Dundee Botanic Garden’s mission is to raise awareness of the vital role of plants in the survival of our planet.

It aims to support scientific research and education in plant science and to contribute to biodiversity conservation. We further aim to encourage a wider appreciation of plants and gardens for recreation and inspiration.

The Garden is one of only 14 university botanic gardens in the UK and we aim to ensure it remains in the top 5 for quality of maintenance and importance with regard to its plant collections, its education work and its conservation work.

See appendices for summary of the recent debate on the Garden which will lead to a more sustainable financial future.
3.5 Institute of Sport and Exercise - status and aspirations

Sport and exercise are now acknowledged as valuable elements of higher education which offer important social, welfare and educational benefits. They contribute much to the life of the University and to the student experience, wellbeing and enjoyment.

ISE Strategy

The primary objective of the estate strategy for ISE is to facilitate growth and to ensure that the facilities available to our staff and students are commensurate with a modern, vibrant and forward looking institution. The provision of such facilities will enhance the reputation of the University, promote student recruitment and generate significant income for the University.

With regards to the estate the ISE has two specific aims:

• Central campus facilities
  The creation of a centralised, modern centre for sport and exercise providing high quality, easily accessible facilities.

• Riverside sports grounds
  The development of a ‘regional’ training complex providing outdoor facilities of a national and international standard.

3.6 Student support facilities

In recent years the University has invested substantially in facilities for students – from the £4m refurbishment of the DUSA building itself to the provision of new teaching accommodation, sports facilities and residences.

However, continued investment is necessary to maintain our current leading position. For example, we will respond to the request from students for additional general space accessible after 5pm. Student perspectives are recognized in setting estate priorities and detailed responses are provided in the appendices.

Student Services

The creation of Student Services in April 2002 brought together Student Advisory, Counselling, Careers, Health, Disability Support Centre, Access Centre, Nursery and the Music Co-ordinator into one group. Disability Support and Access Centres merged in 2003 to form an expanded Disability Services including dyslexia support/tuition.

Refer to: www.dundee.ac.uk/disabilityservices/disability/DDA.html for DDA/DES policy statement.

In drawing together a wide range of professional skills the aim is to build on the current high quality support available to students and develop strategically to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse student body. For some time now, Student Services and the University generally have recognized the benefits that would accrue from relocating all services to a “one-stop-shop” location on the city campus.

Whilst it may be some time before such a broad ambition is realized, local opportunities to centralise and combine student services are regularly explored.
3.7 SWOT table

The following table summarises the main strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats for the estate as derived from the known influences and commentaries.

| Strengths | • An attractive and safe campus environment  
| • Compact and self-contained campus  
| • Some excellent new buildings  
| • Location |

| Weaknesses | • Some older buildings give poor functional suitability and a dated image  
| • Large maintenance backlog  
| • Environmental sustainability  
| • Financial sustainability |

| Opportunities | • Ongoing SFC ring-fenced capital funding for the estate  
| • Ability to achieve better use of space  
| • Ability to improve the quality of space  
| • Improving the financial position of the University |

| Threats | • Large and increasing cost of maintenance backlog  
| • Escalating cost of energy and legislation compliance  
| • Inability to adapt to changing circumstances |
In assessing all of the influences on the estate, there are some clear and dominating themes. These themes are now prioritised and presented as the priorities that drive the estates Vision in section 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 1 • To maintain the campus to the highest possible standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We need to sustain cohesive campuses containing buildings with diverse styles and age profiles, bring the older buildings up to the quality of the new buildings and maintain that quality over the long term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 2 • To use space more effectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating appropriate accommodation and designing more flexible space is commensurate in importance with creating environmental and financial sustainability and there is a clear link between them. Our challenge is to achieve continued efficiency gains in the way we utilise space, and thereby to ensure best value from our continued investment in the estate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 3 • To promote environmental sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whilst economic sustainability is fundamental, achieving improved environmental performance is now seen as a key benchmark in the sector. We need to build on recent foundations by achieving the targets we have set ourselves and by implementing our environmental policy in every respect. Our attitude to this priority is closely linked to our future wellbeing and prosperity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 4 • To provide best value across all estates activities and contribute positively to the University’s financial sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This University-wide priority underpins all the others. The estate strategy can contribute significantly to it by adopting best practice in the management of the estate on all campuses, by providing best value for money and by creating an estate that contributes to making Dundee the university of choice for both students and staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 5 • Efficient facilities management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To recruit and retain an optimum level of resilient and adaptable in-house expertise, dedicated to the management of the estate and apply best practice standards to all activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 6 • To comply with statutory legislation, including a robust disability access programme of works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 7 • To preserve and add to the attractiveness of the city campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 8 • To promote further the profile of the University in its city context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 9 • To provide a safe and secure campus environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 10 • To raise the profile of the estate within the University’s strategic agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
5 • Managing the estate – vision to 2018

This part of the strategy provides a commentary and vision for the key components of the estates function. At the conclusion of each part, a summary is provided of the relevance to the established priorities from section 4.

5.1 Estates management software

We are in the process of implementing a new Property Information Management System (PIMS) which will allow us to identify true property related occupancy costs and subsequently manage these in the most cost effective manner.

The Estates & Buildings department aims to develop and deliver strategic property and workplace solutions which meet the Colleges’ requirements and property related management information is essential in order to achieve this. We have been using a GVA (Grimley) system since 1999. Additional functionality is now required and in PIMS we have a system which will interface and integrate with other University systems.

Planned Preventative Maintenance

The objective of PPM is to help ensure that we are complying with current legislative requirements, funding council requirements and the demands of cyclical maintenance.

Buildings, space and assets

Linking the space data and AutoCAD drawings, the PIMS system enables us to plan and manage accommodation moves. Cost apportionment, taking into account churn and re-organisations, will be automatic and dynamic.

When the system is linked to the finance system it will allow cost apportionment and cross charging. The system will also apportion actual facilities management and property costs.

PIMS will report on all available vacant space allowing the University to make use of the available accommodation in the most effective manner.

Through an HR interface, which will provide an up-to-date manpower inventory (accounting for new starters and leavers), the University will be able to better plan for the accommodation requirements likely to be placed upon it. The system will calculate KPIs for strategic decision-making including gross and net space/person, cost/m², cost/person, available and non-available or vacant space.

PIMS will be able to calculate KPIs per floor, per building, per School and per College and for the total portfolio, allowing the University to benchmark its performance both internally and externally.

Helpdesk functions

The web-enabled helpdesk will provide functionality for supervisors and operatives to manage their workload and update job details.

It will also allow Colleges to place and track work requests electronically so reducing data entry within Estates & Buildings. The web-based system will generate requests, monitor and control the allocation of such requests, create timesheets and provide full job costing.
**Risk registers**

The system will have the capability to link risk registers and method statements to work orders.

**Mobile surveying**

There is a need to move to a paperless system so reducing the data processing time and allowing data to be entered remotely.

PDA/Blackberry technology will make the system more efficient as both job costs and time sheets will be generated automatically.

**Reporting**

The system will have the capability to produce key reports at the touch of a button and these will range from EMS data to internal recharging of Colleges.

**PIMS conclusion**

The Property Information Management System will be a fully integrated system and will deliver on all areas as a "one-stop shop." The system also has the capability to integrate with other University systems in the future and plans are currently afoot to assess the practicalities of using the Estates & Buildings system within other directorates of the University.

The choice of estates management software has a very significant bearing on a range of priorities, including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 1</th>
<th>Helping to efficiently maintain the Estate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority 2</td>
<td>Improving space data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 4</td>
<td>Achieving best value from contractors and suppliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 5</td>
<td>Increasing the efficiency of facilities management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 6</td>
<td>Preparing schedules for statutory maintenance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Space management

The University’s objective here is to maximise all useable space while providing an environment which supports teams’ activities and creativity. Increasingly the workplace needs to be responsive to changing demands, and so space should be designed to be adaptable and planned on the basis of functional need rather than seniority in order to encourage effective teamwork and break down barriers.

We are working to improve the quality of our physical working environment in order to attract and retain the best people, encourage greater networking and teamworking and give our people comfortable break-out space. Our physical environment reflects the values of our organisation and can encourage new patterns of work to develop, facilitate responsiveness to continuous organisational change and generate pride in the workplace.

The key aim of space management is to manage a dynamic and limited resource in order to support academic activity, minimize cost and achieve maximum and efficient design, planning and use of the institution’s space.

In a typical HE institution, the provision, servicing and maintenance of accommodation is the second largest cost. By using space more efficiently and more effectively, thereby reducing overall estate costs, it can release funds for other activities, such as maintenance.

**Space Management Strategy**

The University has recently completed a measured survey to bring building floor plans up-to-date. These form the basis of a fully integrated PIMS system.

Information about activity taking place within the space was collated during 2007, with a view to being validated and updated on an annual basis. Through the Research Council’s UK Quality Assurance and Validation, this process will provide assurance to SFC that it can rely on the figures in the annual TRAC return (government led Transparent Approach to Costing) and the Estates Management Statistical (EMS) returns.

By enhancing communication amongst all users and service providers and by taking a joined-up approach, efficiencies can be achieved. The Space Management Group (SMG) is the key forum for dealing with space allocation, policies and procedures and was set up to raise the profile of space management within the University and to improve communication about space management. The SMG meets four times per year and there are links with the advisory group within the College of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing to deal with the unique issues arising at Ninewells campus.

Space management tools such as utilisation studies, space norms and space charging can significantly contribute to our awareness of space use. The University has been carrying out bi-annual utilisation surveys of central teaching space at the city campus since November 2005. The surveys have led to increased awareness of room booking processes and issues and highlighted areas for improved utilisation.

Once the space data has been collected, the University will be in a position to work towards the development of space norms. Space norms will help us to see whether or not the types of space needed to provide planned academic activity actually match up with what we have.

The University of Dundee Finance (Action Plan) comprises 23 actions, one of which is to “develop cost drivers for allocating overhead costs in order to enable the resource allocation model to be based on full economic costs for 2008/09”. The estate management information feeds into this resource allocation model.
The University has developed general principles for space utilisation. The aim of these principles is to give a clear outline of ways in which space can be utilised for the benefit of everyone:

- All space belongs to the University and no College or Directorate ‘owns’ space.
- Workspaces should be shared or open plan and adaptable where possible.
- Retired staff should only be provided with office space where they continue to make an active contribution to teaching, research and related academic activities.
- Sharing of space between discipline groupings and, where appropriate, between Schools is to be encouraged.
- Local staff common room space is not a priority and should be shared where possible.
- Teaching space should be centrally booked. Local seminar rooms should be added to the central pool.
- Meeting space should be centrally booked where possible.
- Workspace for Masters students should not normally be provided locally.
- Local provision within reason can be made available for PhD students, although as with part-time and visiting staff, space may have to be shared and ‘hot-desking’ is to be encouraged.

**Post Occupancy Evaluations (POE)**

The requirement for POE has come to the fore following the guidelines issued by SFC in 2007.

A post occupancy evaluation should be undertaken to detail and measure the impact a new environment has on learning, teaching and research, staff and students and bottom line efficiencies. POE is used as an umbrella term that includes a review of the process of delivering the project as well as a review of the technical and functional performance of the building during occupation.

Everyone involved in the project, including external consultants and contractors, staff and students, should be asked to participate in POE. To be most effective, evaluation must happen throughout the lifecycle of the building.

At Dundee, the process of POE has been underway for some time. Up to now, we have used our own methodology. For the future, we shall be testing the SFC guidelines on recently completed projects such as the Queen Mother Building, New Teaching Block, Old Technical Institute and the Clinical Research Centre at Ninewells.

**Efficient space management is the subject of Priority 2 but also helps by:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 1</th>
<th>Reducing the amount of space that has to be maintained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority 4</td>
<td>Achieving best value from the space we occupy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 6</td>
<td>Identifying non-compliance spaces which need to be brought up to standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the past two years progress has been made towards Priority 2 by achieving better practice in space management and this will be continued and built upon in coming years.
5.3 Managing the capital investment portfolio

This section draws together our methodology for appraising building initiatives, project managing them and concludes by listing the projects most likely to require significant investment over the period of the strategy.

Appraising investment decisions

Since 2002 we have had a set of internal University procedures (known locally as K2) for appraising our investment decisions.

The principles of the procedure were derived from HEFCE guidance and the existing University procedure also covers:

a) The need to involve the University Court at key stages of the decision making process
b) The need for business plans to be prepared
c) The need for a standard format for appraising projects within the University structure.

K2 principles

We manage capital initiatives in such a way as to ensure best value for money. The following principles are applied in the management of projects to ensure that they are completed on time, within budget and meet all user expectations:

- All proposals for capital expenditure should be consistent with the overall aims of the institution and be thoroughly appraised against specified objectives. The appraisal exercise should examine the costs and benefits expected of, and the risks attached to, the available options.

- There should be a clear understanding of who is responsible within the management of the institution for individual projects and there should be clear and unambiguous systems for the setting and operation of project programmes and budgets. Progress on all projects should be monitored from the earliest stages to completion and all projects should be evaluated on completion. The results of the monitoring and evaluation process must be fed back to the management of the institution and any lessons learned applied to future projects.

Whilst these procedures are a sound basis for our decision making process there is a need to review and adapt them regularly. The following improvements to improve transparency are currently under consideration.
Improving transparency in estate funding decisions

The strategy consultation process results focused mainly on comments on the estate and individual aspirations. However, some responses also suggested that there is room to improve the transparency and fairness of processes for establishing and funding estate priorities.

It is proposed that a core management group will be established for each significant project to oversee the development of that project through to completion and post occupancy evaluation as per SFC guidance. The group will have representation from Estates & Buildings, University senior management and senior academic input from relevant departments.

The purpose of the group would be to:
1. Ensure that appropriate information is presented in a coordinated and consistent manner to allow proper assessment of each case
2. Project the full economic cost of each project
3. Look closely at gearing and the use of University funds in relation to projects.

The system for appraising investment decisions has most significance for Priority 4: ensuring that best value is identified and achieved.

Project management

The University is charged by SFC with carrying out project works with due diligence to ensure best value, best fit and ultimately a sustained and efficient working life for the project.

Combining these aspects of the procurement process into a series of coordinated management functions is seen as the swiftest and most effective way to manage these sometimes onerous and complicated activities.

Estates & Buildings are asked by the University to oversee project management activities ranging from feasibility studies, business plan compilations, funding checks, design team selection and onwards through construction to post-handover support functions, POE and ultimately lifelong maintenance.

In recent years the volume, value and complexity of projects commissioned has increased dramatically; simultaneously there have been profound changes in the legislation relating to the procurement process for publicly funded bodies as well as the onerous compliance issues in health & safety, construction design & management, disability discrimination and fire safety etc.

With the change in emphasis from capital projects to maintenance in the coming years there is a need to revisit and adapt the current arrangements.

The current methodology for project management is summarised in the appendices.

Our performance in managing capital projects has a significant bearing on every priority. We will need to adapt our management approach to fit the changing needs of the University in the future.
Future capital initiatives and financing

Here we identify the most significant projects and issues for the coming years and predict their likely impact:

1 • Backlog maintenance
Such is the scale of the backlog that tackling it will figure most significantly in the coming years, requiring not only appropriate investment but also a well planned implementation methodology. We are aware that deferral of investment in this area will add to the maintenance burden through further deterioration and inflationary pressures.

Drake and Kannemeyer, who carried out the condition survey, recommended that backlog maintenance investment for 2008-2011 should exceed £20m.

This profile needs to be reviewed in light of the financial resources available and to ensure that where possible linked work packages are undertaken at the same time.

2 • Ninewells
The combined effects of deteriorating infrastructure and the need for significant investment in both teaching and research facilities make Ninewells our most urgent priority for investment and we have little option but to commit to this in order to maintain our competitive advantage.

3 • Duncan of Jordanstone
Both the main Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design buildings (Mathew and Crawford) need extensive upgrading, and possibly wholesale replacement. In either event, very significant investment will be required to retain our leading reputation in art and design. A full scale options appraisal will be carried out to identify the best solution for Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design.

4 • Life Sciences
For many years Life Sciences has been our highest profile activity, generating income and prestige for the whole University and city. This profile continues to grow and it is very likely that further expansion will happen in the vicinity of the existing complex.

5 • Significant refurbishments
Of the remaining city campus buildings, Scrymgeour (Law and Psychology) and Fulton (Engineering) are in greatest need of significant overhaul. Both buildings are scheduled to be retained for the longer term and contain key departments, so major investment will be needed during the period of this strategy. As with all significant refurbishments, such overhaul would be planned to tackle essential backlog maintenance work at the same time.

The estimated costs of this programme amount to £140m over the next 10 years, of which £46m relates to backlog maintenance (£16m of maintenance costs are embedded within major refurbishments).

The following two tables give a broad indication of the allocations to the key initiatives over the next three years and also for the full period of the strategy.
## ESTATE STRATEGY
### CAPITAL EXPENDITURE 2008/11

### Key Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>£9m</td>
<td>Duncan of Jordanstone, Medical School Learning &amp; Teaching, Services Infrastructure, Wilson House / IMSaT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>£8m</td>
<td>Duncan of Jordanstone, Services Infrastructure, Scrymgeour Building, Fulton Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>£12m</td>
<td>Duncan of Jordanstone, Services Infrastructure, Scrymgeour Building, Fulton Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ESTATE STRATEGY
### CAPITAL EXPENDITURE 2008/18

- Duncan of Jordanstone: £15m
- School of Medicine: £9m
- Scrymgeour: £5m
- Fulton: £5m
- Backlog Maintenance: £30m
- Rolling Life Cycle Maintenance: £17m
- Services Infrastructure: £15m
- Life Sciences / Biomedical Sciences: £40m
- External amenity space / other projects: £4m

**TOTAL**: £140m
5.4 Completed feasibility studies and options appraisals

The 2001 and 2005 Masterplans provided the overall framework for campus development and also highlighted some of the development opportunities that exist. Several of these development opportunities have been subjected to more rigorous assessment and options appraisals by application of our standard approach.

The main purpose of the options appraisal exercise is to establish, from a range of options, which route (including “do nothing”) is preferable from a University wide perspective.

The process involves a range of interested parties from across the University to ensure that a perspective is gained in the exercise beyond that of the key department or user and that the resulting document is as meaningful and useful as possible.

The Estates & Buildings department plays a key role in liaising with the main department to:
- develop the outline brief
- agree the scope of the appraisal
- involve other stakeholders
- assess potential service providers
- appoint external consultants
- present the report and seek University support for findings

There is merit in achieving consistency across options appraisals so that the findings are reasonably comparable. Standardisation in approach to procurement can also assist in achieving consistency.

We now have a library of completed reports that can be updated as necessary and presented opportunistically as influences dictate. Projects that have recently been completed include:
1) Carnegie extension for Centre for Energy, Petroleum and Mineral Law
2) Scrymgeour annexe for Law
3) Bonar Hall / Dundee Rep Theatre joint development
4) Additional research laboratories for SLS
5) Smalls Wynd multi purpose building

In collaboration with Dundee City Council the existing car park on Hunter Street is being investigated as a multi-purpose development containing car parking, retail, health centre and residential uses.

Whilst fulfilling functional needs, our future buildings need also to satisfy Priority 7 which calls for us to add to the attractiveness of the campus
5.5 Facilities management

Strategic challenge

The University depends upon the Facilities section of Estates & Buildings for the 24 hour, seven day per week delivery of a wide range of services ranging from campus security to keeping buildings wind and watertight. These services are provided by a team of professional in-house staff and contracted-out arrangements, with an annual budget of circa £4m per annum.

Over the last year we have been examining the fitness for purpose of the Facilities section and implementing local changes where necessary. It is recognised that the Facilities section will have to continue to adapt and modernise to meet the changing needs of the University. This future model will include the provision of a 24 hour on-call service, allied to a more effective maintenance regime to provide clean, heated and secure buildings that are fit for learning, teaching and research. When benchmarked against comparable institutions and contracted-out models, our aim will be to provide a superior standard and best value for money.

Present facilities organisation

The present Facilities section was formed in 2005, following a strategic review of Estates & Buildings. Since then, further changes have been made to cover retirements and changes in remit and to introduce a flatter and more responsive middle management structure.

Facilities fitness for purpose

Consultation confirms that the majority of Facilities in-house staff are recognised as doing a good job in a fast moving environment, and have a detailed knowledge of the campus infrastructure. A range of specialisations also exist in Facilities, particularly in the area of combined heat & power and the campus HV network. These specialised services would be difficult to obtain from contractors, particularly on a 24 hour basis. Trades staff are generally well managed at a technical level, and in the main, are focused and committed. A recent survey in the new Colleges showed customer satisfaction to be high.

As the University continues to expand and expectations change, we will outgrow the way we have operated in the past.

The new College structure has raised expectations of improved service delivery across all areas. The Scottish Funding Council requires us to demonstrate an effective building maintenance regime based upon a University-wide building condition survey and the relevant legislative instruments.

In order to yield working efficiencies, campus grounds maintenance activities will progressively be merged with building maintenance schedules and services will be adapted to suit this arrangement.

The on-call system has served the University well over the past eight years but at a high cost. Many call-outs are for low priority work that could be carried out more cheaply during normal working hours. We will retain the out of hours on-call system for problems which are a health and safety threat to people, buildings or equipment.

No less important is the implementation of a programme of works over the next ten years, based upon the recently completed building condition survey, which shows a £46m maintenance backlog.
**Strategy to Support Condition Survey Report**

A revised management structure will be required to see that the buildings and services infrastructure is reliable and supports the University’s core functions, that the appropriate level of investment is made in maintenance, and that value for money is achieved overall utilising both internal and external resource.

This will involve working closely to ensure that capital projects and developments follow a standardised approach and allow for cost effective building and infrastructure maintenance. Involvement in project completion and handover will ensure that correct maintenance procedures are put in place for new and refurbished buildings.

The Facilities section will be restructured and more closely integrated with the Projects section.

**Interim actions**

The setup for providing facilities services is under constant review and is influenced by feedback from colleagues and University staff, changing operational needs and revised priorities.

For example, we have introduced a more robust recruitment policy and improved communications at all levels through regular, well-orchestrated meetings. We have also started formal staff reviews and are now dealing with performance issues in a more proactive way.

Vacant posts are not automatically filled, but reviewed and appropriate action taken to ensure continuity of responsibility allied to a redefining of the role where possible. This has included merging management posts and creating supervisory posts at a comparable level to industry. Such efficiencies cut costs and provide a better career path for staff.

A number of other priorities have been actioned to improve building condition information and management systems and strategies that address future needs will be developed in line with University policies and budgetary guidelines.

**Facilities management is covered in Priority 5 and our facilities performance has significant bearing for most of the stated priorities, but particularly:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority 1</td>
<td>The facilities section will shoulder the brunt of the future anticipated shift towards maintenance and will need to be prepared for this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 3</td>
<td>As the single largest force in Estates &amp; Buildings, they are our front line ambassadors for promoting environmental issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 4</td>
<td>In representing the biggest internal cost centre, achieving best value is critical for the facilities section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 6</td>
<td>Compliance with statutory legislation is largely vested in the facilities section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 9</td>
<td>The best safety and security regimes are driven by sound facilities management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6 Environmental credentials

The University of Dundee offers a wide range of courses at undergraduate and postgraduate levels, and conducts research across a broad spectrum of disciplines. It is a major employer in Dundee and Kirkcaldy, and has a very significant impact on the local community in those cities and the surrounding areas.

As such, the University has very extensive responsibilities to:

- use resources efficiently to minimise our impact on the environment
- comply with all relevant legislation and regulations
- raise awareness within the University community about environmental issues

Through its teaching and research, the University also has an opportunity to advance our understanding of environmental issues at a variety of levels.

The University has published an Environmental Policy statement which sets out plainly and simply the University’s commitment to sustainable development and effective environmental stewardship (see www.dundee.ac.uk/estates/energy&environment/environmentalpolicy.htm).

While much has already been achieved, especially in the efficient generation of heat and power, the efficient management of waste disposal, the development of green travel policies and in raising awareness about environmental issues, there are many areas where further progress can be made.

The University has established an Environment Task Group which is charged with developing and implementing the University’s environmental policy, monitoring, auditing and reviewing our progress against defined targets and reporting to key University decision-making forums. The task group includes senior members of the University staff as well as representatives of the student body. It has set clear targets and will report against these at regular intervals. The task group will disseminate information on environmental issues as widely as possible within the University.

Five key areas have been identified for priority action and these are looked at in more detail in the appendices:

1 • Green travel
Continuing to develop and implement an integrated green travel policy, to promote green travel and reduce pollution from motor vehicles

2 • Energy and water
Reducing our use of energy and utilities

3 • Awareness raising
Promoting sustainable development through awareness raising, technological solutions and financial incentives

4 • Waste management
Improving the efficiency and effectiveness of our waste management systems, with the aim of reducing pollution and the amount of material sent to landfill

5 • Fair-trade status by promoting trade justice
Before the start of each academic year, the task group will:
- review the policy statement in consultation with interested parties
- revise the main priorities listed above as appropriate
- revise the targets set out under each of these priorities in order to achieve continuous improvements in our performance.
Energy sharing for a greener future

The University of Dundee has shown the practical and financial benefits which can accrue from the operation of an integrated energy scheme.

Similarly, we believe that the City of Dundee is uniquely placed to develop a central zone combined heat and power (CHP) system which would derive its energy from a plant located on the water front on the former Carolina Port Power Station. Using non-fossil fuel, such a plant would be capable of supplying the entire city centre with its thermal needs, including the University.

Ready access afforded by the proximity of the plant to the river frontage and national rail network would offset the need for road haulage to supply fuel to the installation.

A collaborative forum already exists between the principal participants in the form of the Sustainable Energy Working Group, which brings together Dundee City Council, NHS Tayside, Abertay University, Dundee College, Tayside Police and University Estates & Buildings staff with the purpose of evaluating and introducing new technologies in appropriate settings.

This group has a wide remit and can examine both traditional energy saving methods and cutting edge technologies.

By improving our environmental performance we will mainly benefit Priority 3, which deals with environmental sustainability, but significant savings are also possible in energy use which will promote financial sustainability. Our environmental credentials are key to securing student appeal, also essential to our long term prosperity.
5.7 Collaboration

In line with the aims of the Efficient Government Initiative we are keen to extend our collaborations with other institutions. In the wider scene, we participated at SFC’s request in the Heriot Watt / Borders collaboration exercise whilst in Dundee we have made good progress with our neighbouring institutions.

There currently exists a good platform of collaborative working at an estates level within the city’s Higher Education Institutions, with shared initiatives in a number of areas.

There is an excellent rapport and trust at an informal level which encourages shared dialogue across the whole range of estate matters. We collaborate in a number of areas including:
- Training programmes
- Asbestos management
- CDM regulations
- Staff resources in site supervision and grounds maintenance

See also appendix 13.

We also have the ambition to expand upon the existing portfolio and include some of the following areas:
- Energy management
- Space planning
- Statutory compliance
- Back office services
- Statutory compliance
- Crisis management
- Land and accommodation use eg residences/labs/teaching space

In future, the potential exists for a single, central and unified estates service in the city. The existence of such a service might also be of benefit to other key public players in the city such as Dundee City Council, Scottish Enterprise Tayside and the NHS Trust.

As with the HE consultation process, recent dialogue with these other city partners has been similarly rewarding, and has served to emphasise the benefits of collaboration in realising a coherent vision for the city.

Inter-University collaboration on Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) compliance

We will continue to give DDA the highest possible profile and deal with the limitations of our campus as best we can. We enjoy a good reputation for accommodating the needs of most and take pride in operating an open door policy for our academic courses.

Conscious that our own position is shared throughout the sector, we intend to use the Scottish Association of University Directors of Estates (SAUDE) forum to share information on this matter. This move may yield operational efficiencies and improved return on national investment.

Collaboration can yield efficiency savings and the Priority concerned with best value (4) is most relevant but operational benefits are also possible through associated improvements in the Facilities Management service eg. in joint training schemes (Priority 5)
5.8 Commercialism and revenue generation

Some of the areas of the collaboration mentioned in the previous section can generate revenue for the service provider and the potential exists to bring in additional funds to support core activity.

Following the Estates & Buildings departmental review in 2004/5 we established the post of Capital Projects & Development Manager, with the remit to combine the management of the capital programme and to improve the commercial activity of the department.

The Capital Projects & Development Manager has made progress in the commercial field but the level of capital activity has limited the extent of new initiatives thus far. However, and in addition to the benefits derived from collaborative ventures with other institutions noted above, there exists the potential to develop further areas such as:

1. Selling services to external companies
2. Disposal and property development opportunities
3. Commercial arrangements for University property

There is a University move towards the disposal of properties that are peripheral, to allow consolidation of the main campus. We also need to be aware of the changing education and city scenes and alert to a time in the future when we may wish to expand beyond these boundaries. The land bank at Riverside is currently used only for sport and exercise but may in future offer additional potential if the current trend of allowing development on the waterfront is extended. Collaboration with other sports facilities providers may release this land for alternative uses either for disposal or University use.

The former railyards to the south also offer expansion potential and we need to keep an eye to the future here.

The Priority most affected by taking a more commercial stance is that associated with achieving best value (4) but such action can also assist with funding as any revenue generated would be reinvested in the estate.
The existing structure (above) was developed in 2003/4 following a review of the department’s activities. The main drivers for the structure at that time were:

- the creation of the Campus Services Directorate (comprising Estates & Buildings, Grounds and Gardens, Residences and ISE)
- the anticipated huge growth in the capital programme
- the desire to improve value for money in support services by integrating functions

Since then, much has been achieved and circumstances have changed to the extent that a further review of the management structure is necessary to:

- acknowledge the existing main areas of responsibility (Estates & Buildings plus Grounds and Gardens)
- ensure that we are equipped to deal with the anticipated shift away from new build and towards maintenance and refurbishment

The current structure makes clear distinction between the Capital Projects and Facilities sections with a manager heading up each section. Whilst this arrangement offers some advantages in drawing clear distinctions between the different roles of the sections, there are some disadvantages relating to divergent priorities on specification for lowest cost versus future ease of maintenance.

The shift towards maintenance means we should look to adapt and redeploy our existing resource and expertise away from capital projects and towards maintenance. Some of the larger maintenance schemes will need to be handled as projects, so changes need not be too radical.

A closer unification of the two main sections is proposed for the future with personnel drawn from a multi-disciplined pool to manage specific works. It is also proposed that individuals will be encouraged to develop detailed knowledge of a small number of specific buildings in order to create teams which can operate more effectively in those buildings in subsequent works.

Our ability to respond and adapt our structure to a changing scene is core to future prosperity, underpinning our success in every stated Priority.
In responding to all of the stated challenges, the following key performance indicators have been identified as our measurable priorities for the period of the strategy:

• **Maintenance**

*Increase percentage of estate classified as A or B incrementally from the current 69% in 2006/07 to 80% in 2018.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual %</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target %</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key things we will do to improve in this area are to have a more effectively run maintenance management regime with works clearly prioritised, costed and efficiently managed in accordance with an agreed, long-term maintenance schedule.

• **Environment**

*Reduce energy consumption/sqm of all buildings incrementally from the current 362 kwh/sqm in 2006/07 to 319 kwh/sqm in 2011/12.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual %</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target %</td>
<td></td>
<td>346</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key things we will do to improve in this area are to increase internal awareness and implement energy saving schemes whilst also procuring the most cost effective and sustainable energy.

• **Space**

**Two KPIs are proposed, one for teaching and one for non-teaching space.**

**Teaching Space**

*Increase the Utilisation Rate of 16% incrementally to 30% by 2012.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual %</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Teaching Space**

*Reduce the average space per FTE staff occupant in University non-teaching space incrementally from 18sqm in 2006/07 to 12sqm by 2018.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2006/7</th>
<th>2007/8</th>
<th>2008/9</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual sqm</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target sqm</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To achieve these targets, we will implement effective space management techniques and promote the use of more flexible spaces.
7 • Conclusion

All of the goals defined in this strategy will be taken forward in a sustained way and in partnership with the wider University community over the next ten years.

The three headline goals relating to condition, environment and space also figure as key performance indicators in the University’s strategic framework. They are deliberately ambitious and will be subject to regular performance assessment and progress monitoring.

In order to maintain our position in the upper quartile of our peer group, significant effort will be required over the period of the strategy. We are resolved to ensure that our goals are achieved.
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Appendix 1 • Background information on the University

A summary of the University's general position and governance is given here.

1 • HOW THE UNIVERSITY WORKS

1.1 University General Information

The University of Dundee is one of the UK’s leading universities, internationally recognized for its expertise across a range of disciplines including science, medicine, engineering and art.

In 2007, the University celebrated 40 years of independence after a 70 year relationship with the University of St. Andrews.

The University has seen major changes in that time. The past decade has been a particularly exciting time of progress and change:
- The University has more than doubled in size since 1994
- The University had an annual turnover of £176m in 2006/7
- The University is home to 17883 students and more than 3000 staff
- More than 12500 of the students are involved in undergraduate studies
- Distance learning students account for almost 20 per cent of all students (including undergraduate and postgraduate)

Following rapid growth over recent years, the number of student applications is levelling off. Now the focus is on raising entrance requirements and improving the undergraduate experience while ensuring our provision is cost effective.

Our student appeal has grown. Undergraduate applications from Scotland and the rest of the European Union increased by 35% from 2002 to 2006, well ahead of the 16% increase for Scottish HEIs. In most areas we comfortably fill our allocation for funded home and EU students.

Dependency on clearing is falling from 20% in 2001 to 5% in 2006. We remain the University of choice for much of our hinterland with 33% of Dundee state school HEI entrants choosing the University. Our pioneering programmes to widen access are highly regarded with the Access Summer School continuing to recruit and prepare 80 students each year. Yet the underlying position on recruitment is volatile.

We remain vulnerable to demographic changes with our local catchment area expected to show a marked reduction in the number of 18 year olds during the next decade. 52% of our undergraduates are from Tayside or Fife. To attract the best students we intend to raise our quality thresholds and look further afield.

Uncertainty over the effects of tuition fees in England and Wales and the future policy of the Scottish Government on funding for higher education will also affect the decisions of potential students as will the issue of debt.
University restructuring
A recent challenge has been to respond to the changing size and form of the University. Since 1994 the University has doubled in size.

Our previous structure of seven faculties reflected a history of acquisitions and the rapid expansion of academic activity.

In spring 2006 we acknowledged the rationale for structural change and created a new academic structure based on four Colleges:
• The College of Arts and Social Sciences
• The College of Art, Science and Engineering
• The College of Life Sciences
• The College of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing

The Colleges encompass 16 Schools. Within a University-wide strategic framework, each College has its own priorities, facilitating flexibility and promoting interdisciplinary working and key connections between its schools, other parts of the University and beyond.

The new structure offers scope for growth and renewal. Yet work remains to be done to fully define our academic strategies at college level. In the coming months we will select our chosen fields for investment and effort, based on academic merit, economic rationale and the scope for creating distinctiveness and competitiveness in new thematic groupings.

1.2 Role of Court

The primary responsibilities of Court, as the governing body of the University, are:

General
1. To oversee the management of all of the revenue and property of the University and to exercise general control over its affairs, purposes and functions, taking all final decisions on matters of fundamental concern to the institution
2. To safeguard the good name and values of the University and to ensure that the institution is responsive to the interests of its stakeholders, including students, staff, graduates, the local community and funding bodies
3. To make such provision as it thinks fit, in consultation with the Senatus, for the general welfare of students
4. To ensure the solvency of the University and to safeguard its assets
5. To ensure compliance with the University’s Charter, Statutes, Ordinances and other rules and regulations of the University, as well as UK and EU law where applicable
6. To appoint the Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University, including the terms and conditions attaching to the appointment, and to put in place suitable arrangements for monitoring his or her performance
7. To appoint a Secretary of the University and to ensure that he or she has separate lines of accountability for the provision of services to the Court and for the fulfilment of managerial responsibilities within the institution
Strategic Planning
8. To approve the mission of the University and its strategic plans, setting out its aims and objectives in teaching and research and identifying the financial, physical and staffing requirements for their achievement
9. To approve a financial strategy, long-term business plans and annual budgets
10. To approve an estates strategy for the management and development of the University's land and buildings in support of institutional objectives
11. To approve a human resources strategy and to ensure that reward arrangements for its employees are appropriate to the needs of the University
12. To monitor the University's performance against approved plans and key performance indicators

Exercise of Controls
13. To make clear and to review regularly the executive authority and other powers delegated to the Principal and Vice-Chancellor, to other senior officers and to other bodies of the University including the Senate and Committees of Court
14. To ensure the proper use of public funds awarded to the University and observance of the terms of the Financial Memorandum between the University and the Scottish Higher Education Funding Council
15. To act as trustee for any legacy, endowment, bequest or gift in support of the University's activities
16. To establish and monitor effective systems of internal control and accountability throughout the University
17. To oversee the University's arrangements for internal and external audit and to approve the University's annual financial statements
18. To ensure that arrangements are in place for the proper management of health and safety in respect of students, staff and other persons affected by University operations

Effectiveness and transparency
19. To ensure, through the appointment of co-opted lay persons in accordance with the Statutes, a balance of skills and experience amongst the membership of the Court sufficient to meet its primary responsibilities
20. To ensure that the proceedings of the Court are conducted in accordance with best practice in higher education corporate governance and with the principles of public life drawn up by the Committee on Standards in Public Life
21. To ensure that procedures are in place in the University for dealing with internal grievances, conflicts of interest and public interest disclosure
22. To monitor its own performance and that of its Committees, with a formal evaluation of effectiveness undertaken not less than every five years

1.3 Remit of Campus Services Committee
Since 2004, Campus Services has comprised the Estates and Buildings plus Grounds and Gardens departments. The remit of the Campus Services Committee is to oversee all aspects of the management and development of the University's estate and associated services and facilities on its various campuses; to review and sustain the University's estates strategy; to advise the Finance & Policy Committee on capital developments and other physical and space requirements to fulfill academic planning objectives; to promote the security of University campuses in terms of personnel (students, staff and visitors), buildings and equipment; to support and oversee the activities of the Botanic Garden; to review and sustain an environmental policy and promote sound environmental practices within the University. In response to the recent huge growth on campus, a sub-group of Campus Services called the Design Review Group was established in 2006 to assist estates with the procurement of high quality in design. The group is chaired by the Convenor of the Campus Services Committee.
### Appendix 2 • Building by building analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Number</th>
<th>Name &amp; Construction Date</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Capital Action Blank - Retained</th>
<th>Replacement Cost (IRV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9401</td>
<td>Tower (1961)</td>
<td>The Tower building will be retained for its existing purpose, with some refurbishment.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>£13,835,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9403</td>
<td>OMS (1904)</td>
<td>The Old Medical School has been refurbished to house part of the School of Life Sciences Learning &amp; Teaching (on 2nd and 3rd floors) and to provide office accommodation for the School of Education, Social Work &amp; Community Education (on the B, G, 1st and 4th floors). The recently completed link with the Carnelley building provides DDA-compliant access to both buildings.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£5,504,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9404</td>
<td>Carnelley (1883)</td>
<td>The Carnelley building has been refurbished to provide upgraded accommodation for CLS Learning &amp; Teaching (B, G, 1st) and CASS (2nd)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£5,504,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9405</td>
<td>Frankland (1965)</td>
<td>The Frankland building has been refurbished in partnership with the NHS. It will be retained for use as part of the Dental School but with the School of Social Sciences occupying the lowest level.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2,240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9406</td>
<td>Ewing (1953)</td>
<td>The Ewing building will be retained for its existing purposes (Engineering) but will undergo some refurbishment.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>£3,454,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9407</td>
<td>Ewing Annex (after 1871)</td>
<td>The Ewing annexe will be demolished and the site retained for development purposes.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Demolition 2009</td>
<td>£822,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9409</td>
<td>CHP Facility (1995)</td>
<td>The CHP facility located within the main boilerhouse will be retained for its existing purpose.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Upgrade of boiler installation</td>
<td>£2,320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9410</td>
<td>Fulton (1964)</td>
<td>The building will be retained for its existing purposes (Engineering), but will undergo extensive refurbishment</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Major refurb.</td>
<td>£14,898,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9412</td>
<td>Estates &amp; Buildings</td>
<td>As with Cross Row and the Microcentre, the Estates and Buildings office will possibly be demolished. The Estates &amp; Buildings function could be divided into two sections with the trades orientated sections (and vehicles) located off campus.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>£986,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9413</td>
<td>Microcentre</td>
<td>As with Cross Row, the Microcentre will possibly be demolished. Currently used as postgraduate study and occasional teaching space.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>£1,462,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9415</td>
<td>Officers Training Corps</td>
<td>Not owned by University.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquire site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9420</td>
<td>Peters (1909)</td>
<td>The Peters building has been refurbished and will be retained for its existing purpose.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£486,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9422</td>
<td>Carnegie (1909)</td>
<td>The Carnegie building has been refurbished and will be retained and possibly extended for CEPMLP.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2,032,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9423</td>
<td>Perth Road 1-3 (between 1777 and 1792)</td>
<td>Retained for existing use (Accountancy and Finance). Refurbishment required.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>£2,569,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9424</td>
<td>Perth Road 11 (around 1851)</td>
<td>Retained for existing use (Research and Innovation Services)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£516,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9426</td>
<td>Medical Sciences (around 1970)</td>
<td>The MSI has already undergone extensive refurbishment. It will be retained for Life Sciences teaching and research and for some general teaching purposes. It will also house the Mathematics Division of the School of Engineering &amp; Physical Sciences</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>£22,568,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9427</td>
<td>Biological Sciences (1972)</td>
<td>The BSI site and adjacent car park will be disposed of. Currently limited use only by Print unit and Resource unit.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>£6,560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9429</td>
<td>Bonar Hall (1976)</td>
<td>The Bonar Hall site may be disposed of if funding for a joint development with the Rep is not forthcoming.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Disposal</td>
<td>£4,340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9430</td>
<td>Chaplaincy (1974)</td>
<td>The Chaplaincy will be retained as a multi-denominational facility. Building meeting rooms and café. Remove bridge to DUSA.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£949,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9431</td>
<td>ICS Building (1921)</td>
<td>The north extension to the Scrymgeour building currently houses ICS and will be retained for its existing purposes, with some refurbishment.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>£2,590,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9432</td>
<td>Hawkhill Place 5-7 (before 1776)</td>
<td>The building will be retained for Archives and Records management</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>£468,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9433</td>
<td>Scrymgeour (1921)</td>
<td>The Scrymgeour building will be refurbished and perhaps extended. It will be retained for its existing purposes (Law and Psychology).</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Refurbishment &amp; extension</td>
<td>£13,745,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9434</td>
<td>Library (opened 1988)</td>
<td>The Library has recently been extended providing new forms of learning space and no further works are planned. A sizeable portion of the existing book stock is being stored off-site, and has made way for the core of the Mathematics, Nursing &amp; Midwifery and Education &amp; Social Work collections.</td>
<td>A / B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£10,367,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9442</td>
<td>Perth Road 21-25 (between 1871-1911)</td>
<td>These flats will be disposed of once Mathematics has been relocated to MSI</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Disposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9443</td>
<td>Springfield (1846)</td>
<td>Most units will be sold off. Other buildings in Springfield (the Chaplain’s residence, Design Services and incubator units) will be retained for their existing purposes.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2,423,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Number</td>
<td>Name &amp; Construction Date</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Capital Action</td>
<td>Replacement Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9452</td>
<td>Nethergate (before 1792)</td>
<td>These buildings will be disposed of. The units currently occupying them (School of Humanities, English, Careers Service and Islamic prayer rooms) will be relocated to the main campus.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Disposal</td>
<td>£2,030,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9465</td>
<td>Perth Road 2A &amp; 4 University House (1864)</td>
<td>University House will be retained for its existing purpose. To be vacated for disposal.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Disposal</td>
<td>£119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9468</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens (1977)</td>
<td>The Botanic Garden will be retained for their existing purpose although the size and running costs of the Garden will be reviewed.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Possible disposal</td>
<td>£1,117,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9473</td>
<td>West Park 1 &amp; 1A (Gardens Cottages) (about 1871)</td>
<td>Retained for existing use by gardeners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9480</td>
<td>West Park 1 &amp; 1A (Gardens Cottages) (about 1871)</td>
<td>Retained for existing use by gardeners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9484</td>
<td>Caird House and Cottage (before 1792)</td>
<td>Will be retained, but perhaps with an alternative use, as the University gateway to the Railyards</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Feasibility - refurb, dispose, demolish</td>
<td>£14,424,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9485</td>
<td>Dream Park House and Cottage (before 1871)</td>
<td>Taypark House will be disposed of following the relocation of the Centre for Medical Education to the Ninewells campus.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Disposal</td>
<td>£1,509,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9488</td>
<td>Wellcome Trust Building (1996)</td>
<td>This building will be retained for existing Life Sciences research laboratory purposes.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£12,893,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9453</td>
<td>Fleming Gymnasium (1905)</td>
<td>This building will be retained for its existing purpose (Forensic Medicine).</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£995,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9454</td>
<td>Riverside (1905)</td>
<td>The playing fields will be retained for their existing purposes. New, all-weather pitches will be created and the changing rooms demolished.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Joint ventures being examined</td>
<td>£844,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9458</td>
<td>Sports Centre (1SE) (1979 on)</td>
<td>These buildings will be retained for existing purposes having recently been redeveloped and extended to house squash courts and a larger fitness centre.</td>
<td>A / B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£6,202,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9526</td>
<td>Crawford (1955)</td>
<td>These buildings will be disposed of. The units currently occupying them (School of Humanities, English, Careers Service and Islamic prayer rooms) will be relocated to the main campus.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Feasibility - refurb, dispose, demolish</td>
<td>£1,873,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9527</td>
<td>Matthew (1971)</td>
<td>As ‘Crawford’ (9526)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Feasibility - refurb or demolish</td>
<td>£19,684,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9530</td>
<td>Airlie Place (1851)</td>
<td>The refurbished space occupied by the School of Nursing and Midwifery will be retained for its existing purpose. The student residences on Airlie Place will be refurbished and redeployed as office space or alternatively identified uses.</td>
<td>B / C</td>
<td></td>
<td>£6,895,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9533</td>
<td>Fleming Gymnasium (1905)</td>
<td>This building will be retained for its existing purpose (Forensic Medicine).</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£995,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9542</td>
<td>Fleming Gymnasium (1905)</td>
<td>This building will be retained for its existing purpose (Forensic Medicine).</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£995,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9553</td>
<td>Riverside (1905)</td>
<td>The playing fields will be retained for their existing purposes. New, all-weather pitches will be created and the changing rooms demolished.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Joint ventures being examined</td>
<td>£844,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9554</td>
<td>Sports Centre (1SE) (1979 on)</td>
<td>These buildings will be retained for existing purposes having recently been redeveloped and extended to house squash courts and a larger fitness centre.</td>
<td>A / B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£6,202,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9559</td>
<td>New Teaching Block (2007)</td>
<td>Retained for existing use.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>£14,828,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9605</td>
<td>Taymills (1905)</td>
<td>The DUSA building has undergone extensive refurbishment and no further major works are planned. Some Student Advisory Services have been relocated here and further relocation potential exists</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£8,290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9613</td>
<td>Cross Row 1 (around 1900)</td>
<td>This row of tenements house a number of student services, the residences office and part of the DUSA management team. Possible future demolition to create, together with the sites of the Microcentre and Estates &amp; Buildings office, a large development site along Small’s Wynd and forming the eastern end of Campus Green.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2,570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9624</td>
<td>Harris Buildings (1909)</td>
<td>The Harris buildings will be retained for existing purposes (Engineering). It will undergo some refurbishment work.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>£4,384,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9628</td>
<td>Scrymgeour Annexe (2000)</td>
<td>The Scrymgeour annexe will be retained for its existing purposes (Psychology)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,535,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9632</td>
<td>Heathfield Car Park (2007)</td>
<td>Situated below the outsourced Heathfield residences there is an underground car park in University ownership accommodating 210 cars. In 2006 the University transferred its residences stock to Sanctuary Housing Association in a 35 year deal. On campus there are 2 sites at Belmont and Heathfield whilst off campus there are a further 3 sites at Taymills, Seabraes and West Park providing over 1800 beds in total. The Taymills residence will not be retained once the existing lease expires in 2011.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>£6,539,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9638</td>
<td>College Hall (1888)</td>
<td>Retained for existing post graduate study use.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,423,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9640</td>
<td>Cross Row 1 (around 1900)</td>
<td>This row of tenements house a number of student services, the residences office and part of the DUSA management team. Possible future demolition to create, together with the sites of the Microcentre and Estates &amp; Buildings office, a large development site along Small’s Wynd and forming the eastern end of Campus Green.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2,570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9645</td>
<td>Harris Buildings (1909)</td>
<td>The Harris buildings will be retained for existing purposes (Engineering). It will undergo some refurbishment work.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>£4,384,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9648</td>
<td>Scrymgeour Annexe (2000)</td>
<td>The Scrymgeour annexe will be retained for its existing purposes (Psychology)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,535,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9651</td>
<td>Heathfield Car Park (2007)</td>
<td>Situated below the outsourced Heathfield residences there is an underground car park in University ownership accommodating 210 cars. In 2006 the University transferred its residences stock to Sanctuary Housing Association in a 35 year deal. On campus there are 2 sites at Belmont and Heathfield whilst off campus there are a further 3 sites at Taymills, Seabraes and West Park providing over 1800 beds in total. The Taymills residence will not be retained once the existing lease expires in 2011.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>£6,539,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9652</td>
<td>College Hall (1888)</td>
<td>Retained for existing post graduate study use.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,423,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9653</td>
<td>DUSA (1974)</td>
<td>The DUSA building has undergone extensive refurbishment and no further major works are planned. Some Student Advisory Services have been relocated here and further relocation potential exists</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£8,290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9659</td>
<td>College Hall (1888)</td>
<td>Retained for existing post graduate study use.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,423,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9660</td>
<td>College Hall (1888)</td>
<td>Retained for existing post graduate study use.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,423,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96623</td>
<td>College Hall (1888)</td>
<td>Retained for existing post graduate study use.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,423,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9663</td>
<td>University House (1864)</td>
<td>University House will be retained for its existing purpose.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>£6,999,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9665</td>
<td>College Hall (1888)</td>
<td>Retained for existing post graduate study use.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,423,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9666</td>
<td>University House (1864)</td>
<td>University House will be retained for its existing purpose.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>£6,999,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9667</td>
<td>University House (1864)</td>
<td>University House will be retained for its existing purpose.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>£6,999,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9668</td>
<td>College Hall (1888)</td>
<td>Retained for existing post graduate study use.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,423,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9669</td>
<td>University House (1864)</td>
<td>University House will be retained for its existing purpose.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>£6,999,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9670</td>
<td>College Hall (1888)</td>
<td>Retained for existing post graduate study use.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,423,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9671</td>
<td>University House (1864)</td>
<td>University House will be retained for its existing purpose.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>£6,999,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This paper summarises the location of key details in the strategy as defined by the headings from SFC guidance notes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timescale</td>
<td>Strategy 10 years, Masterplan 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic link</td>
<td>Strategic framework to 2012 - section 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Section 2.5 and Appendix 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Campus buildings area 173,790 sq m gross excluding residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition survey</td>
<td>2007 Drake and Kannemeyer 10 years – Section 2.7 and Appendix 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Appendix 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Appendix 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Appendix 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness for purpose</td>
<td>Appendix 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Freehold tenure of campus except OTC sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates running costs</td>
<td>£11 m including utilities in 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building performance</td>
<td>Improving due to new build, refurb. and disposals programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlog maintenance</td>
<td>£46 m excluding Ninewells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space management</td>
<td>Section 5.2 and Appendix 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposals</td>
<td>Appendix 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitions</td>
<td>None planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Section 5.7 and Appendix 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option appraisal</td>
<td>Sections 5.3 and 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding / Finance</td>
<td>Sections 2.3 and 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Refer to e-links page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>Appendix 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Appendix 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POE</td>
<td>Section 5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recently completed and projected disposals and their values are given here.

All of the listed properties are scheduled for disposal to allow the funds to be re-invested in the current building programme and in line with the University’s strategic aim of consolidating upon the main campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital receipts to date</th>
<th>£ Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardyne campus</td>
<td>£6,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Old Hawkhill Flats A, B, C, D</td>
<td>£425,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261 Blackness Road</td>
<td>£103,595.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 Magdalen Yard Road</td>
<td>£120,192.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardyne Road Residence - Winnocks</td>
<td>£250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &amp; 7 Roseangle</td>
<td>£2,251,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Springfield</td>
<td>£214,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Wimberley” Glamis Drive</td>
<td>£2,850,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income for 06/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Greenfield Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Roseangle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardyne Road Residence - Westwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Springfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Current income for 07/08(March 08) | £4,926,800.00 |
| Total Receipts                    | £17,640,637.00 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed property disposals</th>
<th>£ Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardyne Road Residence - Redholme</td>
<td>£430,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-25 Perth Road</td>
<td>£650,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Perth Road</td>
<td>£250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Roseangle</td>
<td>£200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Roseangle</td>
<td>£200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/18 Springfield</td>
<td>£250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Springfield</td>
<td>£200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Springfield</td>
<td>£200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162 Nethergate</td>
<td>£500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4 and 8 Perth Road</td>
<td>£200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside Flats</td>
<td>£675,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Receipts                    | £3,755,000.00 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible future disposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site to the west of Millers Wind opposite BSI (currently used as a car park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site to the south of BSI off the Perth Road (currently used as a car park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkhill / Hunter Street car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 Nethergate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166 Nethergate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site adjacent to the Perth Road which forms part of the Botanic Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at the rear of 4 &amp; 6 Roseangle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taypark House (receipt allocated against capital project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes on the interpretation of the condition and statutory non-compliance survey, along with summary data, are given here.

Objectives
The purpose of the Condition and Statutory Non-Compliance Survey was to provide the University with a comprehensive, reliable and independent account of their building stock and the extent to which the physical estate fails to comply with relevant legislation. The report estimates the expenditure required to bring the estate to a satisfactory condition subject only to routine maintenance together with an estimate for the expenditure required to comply with current legislation.

Scope
The survey considered a time period of 10 years. It was confined to the condition or compliance of existing buildings and did not address functional inadequacies or the need to address any requirement for additional accommodation. No account was taken of routine maintenance issues.

The Amount
Condition and compliance costs of £46m reflect 14.14% of the replacement cost of the estate. This is not an unexpected sum and bears comparison to other similar estates. Statutory non-compliance costs reflect 13% of the total cost which again is not unusual for an estate of this size.

Timing
In undertaking the surveys, the surveyors and engineers have noted their preferred years for maintenance expenditure. Largely this turned on the condition of the element but was partly influenced by the need to produce a considered procurement plan for the works, for example to avoid scaffolding a building twice within a short time. The year for the works is therefore a technical judgement based on non-intrusive visual inspection.

The result of these judgements typically produce lumpiness in the expenditure profile over the ten year period considered. It should be recognised that the surveyors judgements are not influenced by existing estate strategies, business plans or maintenance policies the University currently follows and therefore the resultant profile for 10 year expenditure shows a photograph of current state. In other words the profile honestly reflects the “where are we now” position.

Attached is the ten year cost analysis by year which indicates in histogram form, the combined costs of condition and statutory non compliance for years 1 to 10. The ski-slope is quite typical of large estate expenditure profiles in the higher education sector.

Several factors affect the ski-slope and certainly in the first 2-3 years there is reflected in the figures an accumulated expenditure resultant from potential underfunding in previous years and this would be the true backlog maintenance requirement. The first two years also reflect costs of non compliance with legislation which exist now.

The nature and age profile of the estate also has a bearing on expenditure profiles particularly 1960’s buildings where service renewals or fabric remedial works on significant buildings provide peaks of large expenditure in a given year.

Procurement timing also has a bearing on the expenditure profile in that large scale maintenance works may require decant provisions or phasing or indeed require a long lead in with regard to design, tendering or enabling works.
Approach to timing issues
All large institutions face the same dilemma of matching resources against needs. This equally applies to the issues of funding condition and statutory non compliance works. As stated previously the timings allocated by the surveyors and engineers are technical judgements and are not sacrosanct. Deferment of works over the ten year plan is feasible and reasonable. There are two exceptions to this observation in that certain statutory lapses may put lives at risk and therefore assume these should be remedied in the timescales identified. Also items graded D or DX in condition are inoperable or present serious risk of failure or breakdown and should be dealt with preferably in year 1.

The report also does not purport to recommend that the costs should necessarily be incurred. On occasions better value may be obtained by sale, conversion or redevelopment and when the condition and compliance costs reach a significant proportion of the replacement cost then we recommend undertaking an investment appraisal of the various options.

Tools to assist with timing issues
In addition to timing deficiencies our surveyors and engineers have applied to all costed items a priority grade and risk assessment. These factors have been deliberately introduced to assist estate managers in filtering costed items with some degree of intellectual justification. Not all work technically required in year one is of high priority or high risk so for example re-roofing a bicycle shed is less important than re-roofing a lecture theatre but both may be technically due to be done now. By applying priorities to costed items the ski slope can be re-analysed as detailed in the attached cost analysis by Year by Priority. From this reassessment it can be seen that £5.1m of the first year costs relates to Priority 4 items and is work the University may never fund unless vacated buildings are reoccupied. The priority analysis concentrates attention to Priorities 1 and 2 given Priority 3 can be legitimately deferred and Priority 4 works are unlikely to proceed. By applying filters for priority and risk over the ten year time span this produces the table of costs attached (tables 1 & 2). As deficiencies or non compliances are costed, prioritised and risk assessed individually the table can only give an overview for the whole estate. It does however demonstrate that by applying high priority and high or significant risk factors, the potential funding becomes focussed and will help to spread the spend profile over the 10 year period by deferment of lower risk or priority works to later years.
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YEAR | COMBINED COST £000's
---|---
1 | £10,962
2 | £8,696
3 | £6,760
4 | £3,460
5 | £9,904
6 | £1,069
7 | £2,532
8 | £1,652
9 | £513
10 | £143

TOTAL | £45,691
Further information on our work in relation to space management is given here.

1 • UTILISATION SURVEY REPORT 2007/08 - SUMMARY REPORT

1.1 Introduction
Previous surveys of centrally timetabled rooms on the main campus covered roughly 53 rooms or 5% of the Estate. In 2007/08, the survey covered 89 rooms during the recommended week 5 of each semester.

The general pattern of use is consistent each year, showing a bunching of demand for Tuesdays and Thursday, 10am to 12noon. This leads to perceptions of a lack of space whilst rooms remain under-used for substantial periods of the core week.

Teaching activity demonstrates both high demand and high occupancy levels for more small rooms. Accordingly, the University has insufficient small teaching rooms and an over provision of larger rooms.

1.2 Room utilisation rate and the inefficiency multiplier
The inefficiency multiplier was devised by the UK Higher Education Space Management Group to demonstrate the opportunity cost of low utilisation. Figures for the University of Dundee are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey period</th>
<th>Average time used</th>
<th>Average occupancy</th>
<th>NAO room utilisation rate</th>
<th>Inefficiency multiplier = total m² provided for every 1m² used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What this means in theory, is that, for 2007/08, instead of the sector-wide sustainable estate cost of £191.50 per sqm (2005/06 data) the University is paying on average £1283 per sqm to sustain this level of usage. If the opportunity costs are taken into account the rate increases to £1635 per sqm. A low level of utilisation will lead to a high cost of space to support a given activity, and a low ratio of income per sqm. Low utilisation of large, specialist rooms is especially costly.

Scottish Funding Council grading of room utilisation rates are as follows:
• good is equal to or greater than a 35% utilisation rate
• fair is a 25-35% utilisation rate
• poor is equal to or less than 25%.
### 1.3 Hours booked but not used during the one week survey

(February 2008, main city campus including New Teaching Block)

**Table 6.1.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>No of bookings during one week</th>
<th>Hours booked but not used</th>
<th>Hours not used as % of bookings *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative &amp; Academic Support</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine, Dentistry &amp; Nursing</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals/Average</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aim is to reduce the hours not used as a % of bookings figure* to 10% or less by improving communication of cancellations of rooms not required, more accurate estimations of the hours needed and reduction of the practice of booking rooms ‘just in case’ rooms are needed.

### 1.4 Conclusions

The introduction of additional teaching rooms to the main campus may be the reason for the reduced utilisation rate. This is partly because of:
- Poor utilisation in the New Teaching Block during the week of the survey
- A wider spread of bookings across more available rooms
- Booked but unused hours are still unacceptably high
- Demand for more small rooms is still high

### 1.5 Recommendations

- Look closely at the pattern of use in the New Teaching Block throughout the year
- Investigate the possibilities of increasing usage in the New Teaching Block throughout the year
- Consider charges/penalties for non-use of booked space
- Investigate the feasibility of reducing the number of large teaching rooms across campus
- Investigate the possibilities of creating more smaller rooms
- Improve class size predictions
- Improve estimations of time needed
- Early cancellation of rooms no longer required
- Make more use of the full teaching week
- Do not permit the booking of large rooms for small numbers
- All classes should be booked through the central timetabling unit.
- Consider the introduction of a space charge (potentially differentiated on an hourly or space type basis)
- Improve environment and functional suitability of space
- Centrally manage the teaching timetable
- Re-allocate consistently under-utilised space for other activities
- Raise awareness among those who book rooms for specific disciplines.
2 Space management data

The University space management information (room data and floor plans) on all non-residential properties is currently in the process of being brought up-to-date and will be validated annually thereafter. The following charts show a snapshot of the information we currently have and this will be expanded upon to meet data requirements for external returns such as the Estates Management Statistics and to assist internal decision-making.

• MAIN CITY CAMPUS • SPACE TYPE
**Kirkcaldy campus**

The estates department is responsible for the provision of security, janitorial, cleaning and catering services on the Kirkcaldy campus, as well as space management.

The University occupies 2132sqm of useable space at the Kirkcaldy estate, 1759 sqm in the main college block and 373sqm in residential block 1.

Utilisation surveys of the teaching space which took place in October 2006 and May 2007 demonstrated that teaching rooms are used for approximately one third of the time available, showing an average utilisation rate of 13%. However, the remaining space is fully occupied 100% of the time.

• MAIN COLLEGE BLOCK, KIRKCALDY • SPACE TYPE
Appendix 7 • University-wide and national KPIs

This appendix gives a context for our Estates Strategy KPIs by showing them within the Institutional and national KPI lists and also outlines our measurement framework.

1 • University-wide Performance Indicators and Targets

The Strategic Framework to 2012 was approved by Court in June 2007. It sets out a high-level strategic direction for the University expressed through 7 Aims and a range of Objectives. In support, a comprehensive set of 60 Performance Indicators has been developed. 15 of these will be subject to special attention as Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). These are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPI 1</td>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>Entrance requirements stipulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 2</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>Employability : proportion of graduates in full time graduate level employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 3</td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Progression Rates (Year 1 – Year 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 4</td>
<td>2.2.5</td>
<td>Teaching quality satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 5</td>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>Number of full time TPG students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 6</td>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>Volume of research activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 7</td>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>Research overhead recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 8</td>
<td>4.3.1</td>
<td>International student satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 9</td>
<td>5.1.3</td>
<td>Funding attracted for developing technology for commercialisation purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 10</td>
<td>6.1.1</td>
<td>Cost of support services as a proportion of total costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 11</td>
<td>7.1.2</td>
<td>Total income per academic staff FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 12</td>
<td>7.2.1</td>
<td>Proportion of estate classified as new or sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 13</td>
<td>7.2.3</td>
<td>Efficient use of learning and teaching space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 14</td>
<td>7.2.5</td>
<td>Efficient consumption of energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 15</td>
<td>7.3.1</td>
<td>Progress on embedding staff performance management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For 23 of the 60 Performance Indicators, quantitative targets have been set. Where appropriate these are broken down to College level. Our performance in delivering the Strategic Framework will be reported to Court and other fora on a regular basis. We will measure our own progress over time, and also compare our performance with that of a number of other universities.

2 • Sector wide key performance indicators

Within the sector there is agreement that SFC and institutions should use a smaller core set of indicators in future. Financial, space-use, fit-for-purpose and environmental indicators are considered fundamental and public reporting and comparison of these key indicators would give a more regular, useful and comprehensive picture of performance.

The Scottish University Estates Directors (SAUDE) intend to establish Estates KPIs which we can all use to benchmark performance and meet the requirements of external bodies such as Audit Scotland and IPD (the annual EMS return). We also need to meet our various auditors’ recommendations.

There are any number of Estates KPIs used in both the public and the private sector, and so the SAUDE group intends to focus on about 4 which can be readily benchmarked among the 21 Scottish institutions as well as the rest of the UK.
The high level Estates KPIs used most frequently in the UK include:

- £ revenue spend per m²
- £ revenue spend per FTE occupant (staff/student)
- m² per occupant (staff/student)
- Income per m²
- Estates revenue costs as % of turnover
- Ratio of Estates revenue/capex to IRV
- Ratio of total property costs to income
- Energy consumption per m² or per capita
- Utilisation of teaching space

However, a refined and agreed list will be included in the 2008 EMS return and the refined list of KPIs for the sector is likely to focus on:

- Metre squared per occupant
- Ratio of total property costs to income
- Energy consumption per m²
- Proportion of estate classified as new or sound (A/B condition)
The internal process of handling capital projects is summarised here.

Estates & Buildings have traditionally provided support for a range of capital works, originally largely from in-house staff but increasingly by drawing on external design teams as the volume and complexity of projects outstripped the indigenous resources.

In recent years the role has become centred upon project management with co-ordination and liaison between client, users and designers. This role ensures best fit to the brief whilst key management issues such as selection of the most appropriate design team, cost plan controls and contract supervision are addressed.

Professional project managers in the estates department furnish designers with the detailed information essential to establish the design process quickly and under such direction as to avoid inefficient or time consuming investigative working. The level of information held in-house also means that new design teams can be introduced to the work plan without delays arising as they familiarise themselves with infrastructure issues.

Estates & Buildings are therefore an integral and fundamental part of the design team, not merely observers but interactive participants throughout the procurement process.

In many instances the contribution to a project is initiated long before any formal decisions are taken as users open dialogue with the project management team to establish orders of cost or feasibility. It is at this very early stage that assistance of value to determining the optimum procurement route is given.

Application of the Capital Projects Management Process
To cover the tasks detailed below a team of experienced and professionally qualified staff are now in place. Reporting to the Capital Projects & Development Manager there are currently two Project Managers, Estates Manager at Ninewells, three Services Co-ordinators, three Building Clerks of Works and three Mechanical / Electrical Clerks of Works.

The principal activities undertaken by this team can be divided into three separate stages:

1. Pre-planning
This aspect of the overall procurement process is becoming more defined and an essential precursor to undertaking the formal design process.

All projects require some form of a feasibility study allied to an options appraisal to establish whether best value is likely to be achieved and if not what other options may apply. For all projects over £1 million there is a more onerous undertaking whereby a full appraisal procedure is applied. This requires the following heads to be addressed:
- An executive summary
- Definition of specific objectives
- An option appraisal, benefit ranking analysis and cost plan
- Financial issues, income and expenditure set against the business plan
- Funding sources; risk and sensitivity studies
- The recommendation for procurement
- Relevant Committee / Court approvals
2. Contract design and project administration

For the majority of projects external consultants will be selected and appointed; and projects staff within Estates & Buildings determine and administer the functions to be undertaken by the consultants to ensure that the requirements of the department or users are taken properly into account.

The major activities are:
- Selection of an appropriate design team, experienced in the relevant project type
- Attendance at all briefing meetings with user representatives
- Attendance at all design meetings
- Participation in cost control and programme development stages
- Selection of Contractors
- Lead participant at post tender cost reconciliation meetings
- Present at site progress meetings
- Site quality control through Clerk of Works

During the latter stages of the job detailed snagging lists are prepared which identify faults, however small, in order to keep the contractor fully committed to the eradication of defects.

Through the continuous evaluation of progress reports, cost controls and site inspections we monitor the health of every project and this enables us to exert pressure upon all concerned in the prosecution of the contract and hence to help prevent avoidable delays or cost over-runs.

We are always available to assist the Users with any queries they may have relating to the project and through such dialogue to help them understand a process which is not readily comprehensible to the layperson.

3. Post project completion

Buildings are increasingly sophisticated and complex structures which require a full working knowledge of the technology which supports the User’s requirements. To get best value and longevity out of these services requires staff to acquire detailed knowledge of the systems and to learn how to adjust them as befits the working environment. We have a number of in-house technicians who act as the first line of support for maintenance and reactive duties. As more buildings or renovations are added to our portfolio of properties we need to adjust our resources accordingly.

Principal activities are:
- Post handover harmonisation of physical parameter to design conditions
- Continued support towards defects elimination
- Advice to users and feedback to design teams
- Assistance to maintenance teams to optimise performance
- Energy efficiency, monitoring and targeting
- Evaluation of performance against benchmarks

Whereas the timescale for post handover contractual liabilities (the defects liability period) is typically one year in duration, this support function is open ended although we would expect the process to have been concluded by three years in a high tech property.

Finally and as a safety net there is the conflict resolution role which we are prepared and equipped to undertake should the need arise. Our records provide the independent (as against the records of the design team members) evidence, if required, to support our rejection or otherwise of any claims made against us. This process cannot be created after the event and relies upon the careful and continuous recording of the project, during its developmental stages with reference to any problems as they occur. Ultimately we must carry the evidence needed and the training of our project managers is essential to avoid leaving the University exposed in an increasingly litigious world.
Capital project support charge - ‘The Levy’

The ‘levy’ support mechanism was approved in principle by Court in 2001 at the beginning of the current growth period to allow recruitment of additional staff. The initial charge rate was set at 3% of project value where external funds were employed in whole or part. This charge level was determined to establish a self-sustaining business plan on a three year rolling basis. Each of the three stages of activity described in the previous sections has been allocated an equal share of the revenue.

There is scope for adjustment to the rate applied to certain projects and this reflects either very basic or extremely complex projects with special levels of attention. Such variations are agreed between the Director of Campus Services and the relevant senior manager.

Given that the current building programme is reducing, we propose to review the levy and its future. This will signal a re-deployment of projects staff to the maintenance section to ensure the knowledge they have acquired during the construction phase is best used on the maintenance of the building through its life cycle.

However when large projects do resurface more flexible working practices will be required within the department to service individual project needs.

Summary of functions

The project management support service has been established to assist in the procurement and delivery of high quality building and services projects, with the following functions:

- The provision of sound initial advice on spatial re-organisation or expansion ideas or ambitions.
- Appointment of appropriate design teams at cost effective rates.
- Control of design team performance.
- User liaison with design team particularly at the briefing stage.
- Site quality / safety and programme control.
- Cost evaluation and funding co-ordination.
- Final account resolution and dispute resolution.
- Feedback to user groups.
- Life cycle evaluation and benchmarking of projects.

Our duties and contributions change for each and every project, as do the Users’ needs and expectations. The construction industry is also endeavouring to improve its performance in qualitative terms and we see our role as being partners in achieving best value for the University in all areas of the construction and delivery of a sound product.
Appendix 9 • Residences overview

This paper provides an update on the University’s arrangements to manage residences.

Introduction

The project to provide the University with residences in appropriate quantities, of sufficient quality and at endurable cost to students has now reached the point where all construction activity is virtually complete and all residences are fully functioning.

This paper reviews the cost of construction and its implications, takes stock of current operating performance and assesses the likely picture going forward.

Background

In 2002 the University carried out an appraisal of its student residences and recognised that a strategy had to be developed to provide circa 1,800 quality residences. This need was driven by a number of factors:

- Guaranteed residential accommodation is critical to student recruitment and retention
- Students have high expectations of en-suite, self-catered, networked rooms near campus
- A review in 1999 referred to the existing stock as “dated and worn”
- The quality of accommodation must be in line with that provided by competitor HEIs
- Uncertainty and cost of HMO and DDA being fully addressed within existing stock

Four options were considered:

- Do minimum
- Abandon
- Borrowings
- Outsourcing

Outsourcing was decided upon for the following principal reasons:

- Do minimum was potentially too harmful to the University’s reputation and student recruitment, and thus did not present a viable solution.
- Abandoning the provision of student accommodation to the private sector carried a risk of insufficient supply and a resulting negative effect on student recruitment
- The option to borrow funds was thought to be unaffordable and too onerous for the University when consolidated with other proposed capital commitments and priorities.
- Provision of residences was no longer considered a core part of University business

In keeping with the advice of Jones Lang LaSalle, University of Dundee investigated and considered partnership with one of three recommended candidates – Jarvis plc, Unite plc and Sanctuary Housing Association (with its partner Chesterton Structured Finance).

University of Dundee chose Sanctuary Housing Association (“Sanctuary”) as its partner because:

- The Sanctuary proposal represented best value and less risk to the University than the alternatives
- The Sanctuary Housing Association ethos is much closer to the Public Sector ethos of the University
- Sanctuary offered better security and better terms for the transferring staff
- The mechanism to achieve this was the establishment of a company Dundee Student Villages (DSV) in partnership with Bank of Scotland (BoFS) as providers of finance and Sanctuary as operators and managers of the residences. The University would retain a direct involvement via the board of DSV.

University of Dundee Court set up a Residences Sub-Group to work with and consider recommendations from a working group comprising The Deputy Principal, the Secretary, the Director of Finance, Residences management and a Finance manager. The outsourcing arrangements were finally approved by the sub-group in mid 2004.
**Concept**

DSV would be established as a Single Purpose Vehicle (SPV) with charitable status to build, own and manage the residences for a period of 35 years and would have a trading subsidiary to manage the conferencing business at West Park.

Existing residences that were being retained would transfer to Sanctuary and new residences to provide some 1,100 beds (Heathfield 430, West Park Halls 140, Seabraes 190 and Belmont 340) would be built over a period of 3 years. These new residences would replace old residences at Peterson, Wimberley, Springfield, Belmont, Airlie Place and Roseangle (Tay Mills, providing significantly inferior and cheaper accommodation, would however remain in University of Dundee management until the lease expires in 2011). The University of Dundee would be able to realise some £11m of cash from the disposal of old residences.

Future cash flows would be determined by the construction of a model to forecast the likely trading of DSV based on key assumptions regarding occupancy rates, rental rates, full life cycle maintenance costs, operating costs and inflation.

At the end of the 35 year arrangement and when the associated debt has been repaid, the properties would transfer back to University of Dundee.

The Board of DSV would comprise two representatives from each of the three partners, Sanctuary, BofS and University of Dundee.

Legal advisers were Biggart Baillie, financial advisers British Linen Bank, and VAT advisers RCB. Co-ordinating expertise, financial modelling services and construction project management would be provided by Chesterton Structured Finance (and later UK Structured Finance Ltd).

**Capital cost**

A key ingredient of the project was the likely cost of building and the amount of the related finance. The project was approved on the basis of a build cost estimated by cost consultants with any over-runs being to the account of University of Dundee. At an early stage, higher build costs were identified principally due to increased cost of steel. As a result, it became clear over time that the capital receipt element of the project would not be realised.

On the positive side, the value of former residences increased from the inception of the project, with total receipts now expected to be circa £18.5m.

**Operation**

All residential accommodation is marketed through University of Dundee’s Residences Office and all student letting contracts are with University of Dundee.

The University decides each year how many rooms in DSV it wishes to take and pays only for those rooms. While University of Dundee thus limits its exposure to variations in student demand for accommodation, it has a continuing interest in ensuring the viability of DSV. University of Dundee retains a percentage of the income from student residences fees to cover the running costs of the Residences office.

As part of the arrangement, circa 100 University of Dundee staff transferred to Sanctuary’s employment under TUPE regulations. In addition, a number of staff were made redundant following the cessation of catering in residences.
West Park is run by West Park Centre Ltd, a trading subsidiary of DSV which is managed by Sanctuary. The main house and conference centre are used all year round for day conferences, seminars, dinners, weddings and other social events. There is ample on-site parking. The student accommodation is available for residential conferences from June to August. Sanctuary operates West Park against a business plan which specifies the surplus West Park is expected to generate each year. If Sanctuary exceeds the surplus, the excess is shared between Sanctuary and DSV.

All three partners in DSV are incentivised to make DSV work. BofS and Sanctuary are more incentivised than a funder and service provider would usually be through their close involvement and trustee/partner status. The University is incentivised in that, if the project was wound up prematurely, and Sanctuary’s services were dispensed with, the University would pay compensation to Sanctuary.

**Forecast trading position - assumptions**

The original project, which commenced in July 2004, had an expected life of 35 years. The project is thus currently in its fourth year.

The financial model identifies the number and types of rooms available in all the residences and makes assumptions about the rates that can be charged at the outset. It also makes assumptions about “Commercial Income”. Rental income rates and commercial income are assumed to escalate annually.

Assumed rent volume allows for an element of rooms not let, “voids”.

Costs (maintenance costs, Sanctuary management costs, DSV admin costs and FF&E costs) have also been escalated by a defined percentage.

The incidence of maintenance costs has been plotted against the build up of the LCM fund and interest calculated on the cash surpluses.

Interest on borrowings has been calculated on a fixed rate.

Depreciation is calculated to write off the original building costs within DSV and all subsequent capitalisations within DSV over the life of the project.

**Forecast trading position – implications**

In the finally adopted model (dated 18 October 2004), DSV was projected to make losses every year for the first 20 years before moving into surpluses which would then yield a net surplus at the end of the project (year 35).

DSV losses will adversely impact University of Dundee’s I&E account to the extent of a one-third share cumulatively depleting reserves until surpluses are achieved.

Initial construction and set-up costs within DSV are all funded by borrowings. Total borrowings increase whilst interest charges exceed net cash flow from operations. Total borrowings peak around years 12 to 15 and then reduce thereafter as net cash flow from operations exceeds interest charges. At the end of the 35 year forecast period, the assets have a remaining net book value matched by a remaining loan balance.

Any over performance within DSV would leave a cash surplus which could then be used to offset the remaining loan balance.
**Current trading position**

Since the contract was signed, DSV made losses in 2004-5 (when the number of available rooms was greatly reduced due to building works) and in 2005-6 (during which building works were continuing, affecting both occupancy rates and use of the conferencing facilities). Trading in 2006-07 was adversely affected by an over-supply of purpose-built student accommodation in the city. Despite this, nominated occupancy levels have improved from 85.5% in 2006-7, to 89.5% in 2007-8. The West Park Conference Centre has also performed better than the model.

**Looking forward**

There has been unexpectedly fierce competition from the private sector and this is expected to continue to some extent and be aggravated by a private provider’s decision to build new residences for the University of Abertay.

Known competition within the sector within the city includes:

- The Hub - 507 rooms (starting at £60 per week for 50 weeks)
- Courthouse Apartments – approx 120 rooms in 31, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom apartments (now reduced from £75 per week to £50 per week)
- Unite - 117 rooms (from £50 per week)
- Horsewater Wynd – 319 rooms in 86 flats of varying size under development
- Brown St - 450 room development at planning application stage (DSV have lodged an objection)
- Parker St - 500 room development with planning permission (Opal/Abertay)

Income assumptions and occupancy rates in the original model now appear somewhat ambitious and a revised forward projection has been developed which assumes occupancy levels of 90% per annum. Running costs, together with a number of other assumptions, are being reviewed to accommodate this and the financial model is being revised. The total number of rooms available to the University will reduce from 1836 to 1587 in 2011, when the lease on Tay Mills expires. As Tay Mills provides the main University accommodation for families a policy is required to address this post 2011.
The University's aim is to retain 1,000 parking spaces on the city campus for staff, visitors and students with special needs. We have made good progress in concentrating parking spaces on the periphery of the campus and in giving greater priority to pedestrians.

We are currently implementing a travel plan strategy to encourage more staff and students to use sustainable methods of transport to and from the campus, such as cycling, public transport, car sharing and walking. See also car parking image and notes in Section 3.

Car parking regulations (summary)

Car parking facilities on the city campus are available to all members of staff, subject to availability and the annual purchase of a permit. There are two types of permits:

- An Annual Permit for the period from 01 October 2007 to 30 September 2008, which costs £250

- A Pay and Display Permit which costs £5 and is also valid for the same period. The Pay and Display Permit is used in conjunction with daily parking tickets bought from parking meters installed at numerous points on the campus.

General rules state that:

- Permits will only be issued to students with an established medical need.

- In the interests of pedestrian safety and to allow free movement of vehicles within the precinct and access to buildings in emergencies, it is important that car owners park only in authorised areas.

- Maintenance of safe access routes for the visually impaired is a priority and parking on pavements is therefore strictly prohibited.

- The Traffic Wardens are responsible for the supervision of all parking on the campus and are empowered to inspect vehicles for the displaying of valid parking stickers.

- Failure to abide by the parking regulations may result in loss of permit, disciplinary action or prosecution.

- Frequent inspections are made of parking areas and vehicles not displaying a valid parking sticker will incur a fine of £25 per occasion.

- The co-operation of car park users is sought in making the scheme successful and of benefit to all concerned.

- Visitors to the University may be issued with temporary parking permits free of charge by prior arrangement.
Appendix 11 • Botanic Garden

**Background**

The University of Dundee has an established Botanic Garden off Riverside Drive on land which it owns (about 10 acres) and land (11.8 acres) which it leases from a Trust comprising owners of houses on the Perth Road in return for a peppercorn rent and removal of their garden waste. The lease lasts until 2071, was last modified in 2005, and states that the land is “to be used by the University solely for the propagation of trees and plants and generally as a botanical garden”. Any major departure from the overall concept of a botanical garden requires the consent of the Trustees to effect.

It aims to support research and education in plant science, to contribute to biodiversity conservation, and to encourage a wider appreciation of plants and gardens for recreation and inspiration. Its stated purposes are to:

- Encourage and support plant science and education at all levels, particularly as a contributor to the University recruitment through the enthusing of young biologists
- Help conserve the natural environment and to host ex-situ conservation programmes
- Engage in and support horticultural and botanical research that will further the understanding of plants in their environment
- Encourage people from all walks of life to visit the Garden and to promote it as a tourist destination
- Provide training and education for people interested in gaining practical horticultural skills
- Provide plant material, facilities and expertise for biology and environmental science courses at the University of Dundee.

**Working group**

A working group was established in 2007 with the remit “to consider options to secure a sustainable future for the Botanic Garden”. It concluded that:

- The University has a Botanic Garden of which it can be proud; the collection represents about one half of the evolutionary tree of plant life.
- The staff of the Botanic Garden have worked hard to produce a Garden that is attractive to visitors (it is a 4* Visitor Attraction), and to introduce activities serving a diverse range of customers (including child and adult education).
- Because of changes in the academic provision of the University, the Botanic Garden is currently used more as a community resource than a resource central to the University’s academic mission.
- Given the University’s desire to reduce its current level of expenditure on the Garden, greater diversity of funding sources will be required if the Garden is to be sustained.
- Discussions between and within the membership of the Working Group have identified several potential sources of funding that could be available to the Garden in future.

The working group recommended that the University should:

i) retain its Botanic Garden;
ii) define clearly the money that it is prepared to contribute to recurrent and capital funding;
iii) revise governance arrangements to appropriately include the Friends, Dundee City Council, and others.
More detail on our main environmental initiatives (green travel, energy and water, awareness raising, fair-trade status and waste management) is given here.

1 • Green Travel Plan

The University’s Green Travel Plan was developed in conjunction with the Campus Car Parking Strategy and was submitted to and approved by Court in June 2004. The Green Travel Group was formed in the autumn of 2004 under the Convenership of Estates & Buildings with the objective of implementing and developing this plan. In addition to representatives from various departments and interests in the University the Group’s membership also included members of Dundee City Council’s Specialist Travel Planning Unit who had collaborated with us on developing the Plan.

Four main initiative areas

The group identified four main areas to take forward initiatives and sub groups were established to develop action plans in these areas. These were as follows:

- **Walking**
  Integrated into the Institute of Sport & Exercise’s programme

- **Cycling**
  BUG (Bike User Group) formed to promote and give advice plus ‘Cycle to Work’ scheme

- **Public Transport**
  Analysis of need and promotion of services in conjunction with our city council partners including a ‘Bus Season Ticket’ scheme

- **Effective Car Use**
  We aim to reduce the number of single occupancy car journeys by 5% by December 2008. Initiatives developed in conjunction with Car Parking Strategy include joining city-wide ‘Lift Share’ scheme and pay and display car parking arrangements. Our own estates vehicles will be switched to LPG or hybrid fuels.

Promotion, communication and partnering

Appreciating that travel planning has a great deal to do with the gathering and then the disseminating of information, the group and its sub groups have spent a good amount of time and effort on communicating with students, staff and partners, particularly in the city.

This has included surveys, exchange of information with partners, promotion days and producing promotion material. We have also established a website and a dedicated e-mail address where staff and students can address particular requests or queries.

On a wider front we are also a participating organisation in TACTRAN involved in developing the Regional Transport Strategy of which travel planning is an important element. Members of the group also attend national forums and appropriate courses.

Future action and development

The group, having established an organisational structure within the University and partnerships in and outwith the city, feel their first priority is to maintain and develop these initiatives, particularly with an ever changing “population” as in a University.

However it also feels that having been developing from the original plan for nearly four years, it is time to take a more strategic view of its activities. In May 2008 it therefore intends to produce a completely new and updated plan taking account of past achievements and future objectives.
2 • Energy and water
The University has recently adopted a new Environmental Policy which recognises that the University of Dundee, as a major user of energy and natural resources, has a significant impact upon the environment at local and regional levels.

Whilst maintaining University requirements for teaching and research, the policy has set savings targets of 2% per annum of energy and water over the next 5 years.

The main initiative areas are:
- To develop and implement a coherent awareness raising strategy.
- To incorporate energy efficient design criteria, in relation to new buildings.
- To introduce a series of energy audits to identify areas for energy improvements.
- To introduce a programme of energy improvement works employing new technologies where financially viable.
- To regularly monitor the efficiency and operation of the existing principal energy plant.
- To increase the proportion of renewable energy purchased by the University.

3 • Awareness raising
A major factor in meeting the proposed targets set out in the new University environmental policy, will be the development and implementation of a coherent awareness raising strategy including:

The updating of the University web pages to include the latest good practice advice and reports on progress towards meeting the targets set in the environmental policy.

The provision of the necessary technical support and advice to staff and students.

The promotion of good environmental practice to staff and students through various methods e.g. posters, Hermes, newsletters, group e-mails, Contact, press releases, presentations and awareness days.

The instigation of a change to the internal taxation model so that Colleges are responsible for their energy and water use. Training of staff to be provided.

The provision of monthly progress reports to Colleges to indicate actual consumption against target.

4 • Fairtrade status
The new environmental policy states that the University is to achieve Fairtrade status by 2008. The University recognises that Fairtrade standards require that producers “increase the environmental stability of their activities” and that universities that have Fairtrade accreditation have demonstrated their willingness and ability to alter purchasing practices based on social and environmental factors. A commitment to Fairtrade demonstrates understanding of the global impacts of university decisions, which is crucial to a holistic view of sustainability.

5 • Waste management
The new environmental policy states that the amount of recycling is increased by 2% year on year for the next 5 years. A target of a 10% reduction in University paper purchases has also been initiated. The following initiatives are to be introduced:

- To develop and implement a coherent awareness raising strategy (see awareness raising).
- To increase the number of external recycling points (bin stores) on campus.
- To provide additional internal recycling paper facilities within colleges/departments.
- To provide brand new facilities for the recycling of cartridges and mobile phones.
- To instigate a switch to network printing from local and double sided where appropriate.
- To encourage a policy of 100% recycled paper to be used for standard printing purposes.
Further detail on estates related collaboration in the city is given here.
Following a meeting in April 2006 of senior estates personnel from the three city institutions, the following note of agreement was issued:

- The initial cluster meeting a good scene setter but there is a need to distinguish between issues that we jointly feel are worth pursuing locally and sector wide initiatives which we may not.
- The following table shows this distinction and also identifies areas of potential collaboration that are not solely estates issues. All areas in List A will also figure in List C for general consideration by the sector.
- Broadly speaking, we wish to progress the items on List A with an agreed programme and measured outcomes. We will offer Estates support to our own Institutions as necessary in List B and we will continue to assist SFC and help to map out a collaboration strategy for sector wide release.
- List A will be regularly reviewed with initiatives added or dropped if added value is not apparent within agreed timeframes.
- Whilst it is useful to have a formal list of measurable collaboration areas specific to Dundee, we feel that regular dialogue is the key to fruitful collaboration and gaining local market knowledge.
- The possibility of adding other Institutions was discussed. Whilst additional collaboration with others is likely, there seems little merit in expanding the group per se but distinct disadvantages if the group becomes unwieldy as a result of widening membership.
- Our aim is to make collaboration meaningful and beneficial to those involved. We wish to avoid pretence and focus on getting added value without extreme effort.

UNIVERSITY OF ABERTAY / DUNDEE COLLEGE / UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE
DUNDEE CLUSTER - COLLABORATION AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Specific to Dundee (Estates Issues)</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Specific to Dundee (Non Estates Issues)</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UA DC</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>UA DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Consultants / Term Appointments</td>
<td>UA DC</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Back up Server</td>
<td>UA DC</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Residences Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td>UA DC</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Tertiary Education Shop</td>
<td>UA DC</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Sport Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Suppliers</td>
<td>UA DC</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>UA DC</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>International Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Estates Staff Resources CofWs, Engineers, PMs, Space Management</td>
<td>UA DC</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Students Association</td>
<td>UA DC</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Universities with Medical Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>UA DC</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>UA DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Car Share</td>
<td>UA DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 14 • Consultation questionnaire

The following questions formed the basis of individual consultations and also a web based invitation to all staff and students to comment on the estate:

1. For your (College/Directorate/area of responsibility) what do you see as the main Estate challenges?
2. What changes are necessary to the accommodation you currently occupy?
3. What aspects of the Estates service do you believe can be adapted or improved?
   • general
   • quality of internal environment
   • quality of external environment
   • security
   • parking
   • safety
   • advice on building related matters
   • cleaning
   • maintenance
   • refurbishment
4. Is current space allocation to your group adequate?
5. Do you believe that the University currently invests adequately in the Estate?
6. What are the best aspects of the University?
7. What are the worst aspects of the University?
8. What other building projects do you think should be considered?
9. Do you have any other comments on the Estate, the Estate strategy document or its preparation?
University internal processes and external influences on procurement are summarised here.

Estates recently arranged for a secondment from the University’s Procurement Office (which is a department within the Finance Office) to perform an internal health check on our procurement procedures. This check provided several pointers on how we might adapt our systems to ensure compliance and yield improved VFM.

We continue to work in close collaboration with the Procurement Office to establish a range of contracts. Recent collaborations have included term contracts, furniture, equipment and IT software. An additional benefit of this collaboration is that staff in Estates have an increased awareness of their responsibilities when carrying out procurement requirements in order to achieve best value for money, which takes into consideration appropriate cost/quality ratios.

The Procurement Office has also benefited from this collaboration with Estates. As Estates is involved with all of the University’s departments, it has assisted the Procurement Office with an increased awareness of the needs across campus. This has contributed to the Procurement Office achieving some of its Strategic Procurement objectives which benefit the University in terms of cost and time savings.

We are actively involved in the various APUC Ltd. initiatives (having membership on their user intelligence groups for those commodities where we offer expertise, i.e. utilities, maintenance and workshops, etc) and are conscious of the need to exploit collaborative buying opportunities. We work hard to remain at the forefront of the drive to secure best value energy for university estates.

For smaller projects we currently employ term consultants but use fee bidding on medium jobs whilst the OJEU process is utilised for larger projects.

In future, we plan to expand the number of framework agreements we have with contractors and consultants. This may be in collaboration with APUC Ltd. or it may be a regional contract with other HE/FE institutions in and around the Dundee area or, where appropriate, it may be the University of Dundee alone – local influences can sometimes be critical when delivering goods and/or services. This not only ensures compliance with European procurement legislation (which protects the University from challenge) but also helps to streamline the day to day procurement process for end users who should benefit from savings in time and process.

Estates and the Procurement Office have an ongoing commitment to working together to achieve best value for money for the University and ensuring compliance with all procurement legislation. Some examples of websites where further information is available regarding contracts are given in the e-links section opposite.
e-links

This strategy is available at:
www.dundee.ac.uk/estates

1 • University of Dundee
www.dundee.ac.uk

2 • Risk Management Monitoring Group Remit
www.somis.dundee.ac.uk/court/riskm/strategy.htm

3 • Crisis Management and Disaster Recovery Plan
www.somis.dundee.ac.uk/court/riskm/guide_managing_a_crisis.doc
www.somis.dundee.ac.uk/court/riskm/Risk_DisRecPlanTemp.doc

4 • Estates & Buildings
www.dundee.ac.uk/estates

5 • Car Parking Policy
www.dundee.ac.uk/estates/carparking/regulations2005.htm

6 • Helpdesk Procedure
www.dundee.ac.uk/estates/contacts.htm

7 • Strategic Framework
www.dundee.ac.uk/principaloffice/towards2007/Planning%20Framework2006-2012update%202004.doc

8 • Consultation Questionnaire Responses and Contributors
www.dundee.ac.uk/estates/Management/annualreport/estrategy.htm

9 • DDA
www.dundee.ac.uk/disabilityservices/disability/DDA.html

10 • Procurement
www.dundee.ac.uk/procurement
www.apuc-scot.ac.uk
www.online.ogcbuyingsolutions.gov.uk

11 • Environmental Policy
www.dundee.ac.uk/estates/energy&environment/environmentalpolicy.htm
Architects for main featured projects:
QMB • Page and Park
NTB • Campbell and Arnott
JBC/CRC/TMRC and Ninewells vision images • Boswell Mitchell and Johnston
ISE and Carnelley link • Nicoll Russell Studios
Library extension • Austin Smith Lord
Student residences • Smith Scott Mullan

Thanks are due to everyone who contributed to this strategy document, from the consultation process through to drafting and final design, but with particular gratitude to Sandi Hamilton, Marianne Kenley (both Estates & Buildings) and Tara Wainwright (Design • Print • Marketing).

All images courtesy of Design • Print • Marketing, University of Dundee unless otherwise stated.
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